DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 200 129 HE 013 613

TITLE	The Planning Project Grant to Develop a Cooperative Action Program in Urban Affairs and Academic Public Service. Final Program Report, March 1976.
INSTITUTION	American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C.; International City Management Association, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C. Office of Intergovernmental Science Programs.
PUB DATE	Mar 76
GRANT	ISR-76-00511
NOTE	117p.; For related document, see HE 013 612.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*College Role; *Cooperative Planning; Federal Government; Government School Relationship; *Higher Education; Local Government; Outreach Programs; *Professional Associations; Program Design; Public Relations; School Community Programs; *School Community Relationship; Urban Universities
IDENTIFIERS	*Public Service

ABSTRACT

In recent years there has been no national educational association with an office devoted to the encouragement of college and university involvement in urban affairs and public service. To fill this void, the American Council on Education asked the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) to assume leadership responsibilities for the development of such an office for several higher education associations. AASCU, with cooperation from the International City Management Association (ICMA), proposed to organize and conduct an intensive short-term planning project for a cooperative action program in urban affairs and academic public services. Three objectives were set and met: (1) to identify specific public and private institutions with interest in the proposed program; (2) to engage key individuals from these groups to assess their needs and interests and potential input; and (3) to establish formal linkages with these groups interested in program participation. A planning workshop secured endorsement for an Office of Urban Affairs and Public Service. New goals and objectives for the office are identified, including (1) establishing new links among academe, national organizations, private foundations, and local government, and (2) identifying alternatives for the modification of college teaching, research, and service within the community. Appended are pre-workshop coorespondence, the workshop proceedings, and other workshop information. (Author/PJM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED200129

FINAL PROGRAM REPORT ON THE PLANNING PROJECT GRANT TO DEVELOP A COOPERATIVE ACTION PROGRAM IN URBAN AFFAIRS AND ACADEMIC PUBLIC SERVICE

ISR 76-00511

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
NSF
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH. EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SUBMITTED TO

THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION
OFFICE OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL SCIENCE AND
RESEARCH UTILIZATION

BY

THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

AND

THE INTERNATIONAL CITY MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATION

MARCH 1976

HE 013 613

CONTENTS

Page

FINAL PROGRAM REPORT . . . . I.

Introduction 1

Proposed Objectives 2

Planning Activities 2

Conclusions 7

Appendix

A. Letter Sent to Educational Associations 10

B. Letter Sent to Public Interest Groups and Federal Agencies . . . 12

C. Letter of Invitation to December Staff Conferences 14

D. December Staff Conference Agenda 15

E. December Staff Conference Summary 16

F. December Staff Conference Participants 19

G. Letter of Invitation to the Workshop 21

WORKSHOP PROCEEDINGS . . . . II.

Introduction . . . . i.

Agenda . . . . ii.

Edited Proceedings . . . . 1 - 47

WORKSHOP APPENDIX . . . . III.

List of Participants . . . . i.

Background Papers & Authors . . . . 1 - 36

Summary 37

AASCU - ICMA
REPORT TO THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION
GRANT NUMBER ISR 76-00511

Introduction

This report on the planning project to develop a cooperative action program in Urban Affairs and Academic Public Service has been prepared in accordance with National Science Foundation policy and in partial fulfillment of grant agreement between the Foundation's Office of Intergovernmental Science and Research Utilization and the American Association of State Colleges and Universities.

With the closing, several years ago, of the Offices of Urban Affairs in the American Council on Education and the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, there has been no national education association with an office devoted to the encouragement of colleges and universities' involvement in urban affairs and public service. To fill this void, the American Council on Education asked the American Association of State Colleges and Universities to assume the leadership responsibilities for the development of such an office and of organizational relationships that would fulfill this need for a number of higher education associations.

The American Association of State Colleges and Universities, through its committee on Urban Affairs, has considered this matter for over one year. The AASCU remained convinced that higher education uniquely combines three significant and relevant roles, that of training, research, and public service - all of which singularly or in various strategic combinations have an extraordinary potential for helping solve many problems faced by state and local governments. While some colleges and universities have implemented effective public service programs, many more are still searching for effective interactive roles and productive working relationships with state, county and city officials. It was determined by the Urban Affairs Committee, primarily through the leadership of its Chairman, Dr. Clark D. Ahlberg, President of Wichita State University, that any effort to assist universities and colleges to identify and direct their resources to serve more effectively the needs and requirements of state and local governments, should incorporate the needs, interests, resources and involvement of organizations representing governmental officials as well as higher education associations.

With this view in mind, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities obtained the support and cooperation of the International City Management Association. ICMA agreed to participate in the development of a planning grant proposal designed to determine the feasibility of developing a cooperative action program in urban affairs and academic public service. The proposal was submitted to the National Science Foundation on July 3, 1975. The proposal was endorsed by the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges; the Association of American Colleges; the American Council on Education; and the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.

Proposed Objectives

Based upon the assumption that the resources of higher education can be applied more effectively to the needs of state and local governments, the planning grant was requested in an effort to identify new methods, procedures or systems that would assist in making this possible.

Specifically, it was proposed that the AASCU and the ICMA would organize and conduct an intensive short-term planning project designed to develop the basic framework and work out detailed objectives and operational plans for a cooperative action program in urban affairs and academic public service designed to: (1) identify the specific state and local governmental public interest groups, federal agencies, private foundations and higher education associations and councils which might have interests, needs or resources relevant to the proposed program; (2) engage key individuals in each of these groups in discussion of their needs, resources and interests in order to determine if they could both contribute to and benefit from the proposed program; and (3) establish formal linkages with and commitments from those organizations who want to participate in the development of the program structure and activities.

The grant provided the resources necessary to consider specifically the formation of an active working group made up of local and state governmental public interest groups, federal agencies, and higher education associations and councils which would build the foundation for a cooperative action program in urban affairs and academic public service.

It was envisioned that an Office of Urban Affairs and Academic Public Service could be developed and operated by the AASCU representing a number of education associations and with the assistance of and in cooperation with other organizations invited to participate in this planning program. Although some operational goals, objectives and programs were noted in the proposal, it was planned that the organizations participating would help identify specific action programs based upon their particular needs and objectives and resources.

Planning Activities

Responsibility for overall project direction was assigned to Dr. William M. Fulkerson, Associate Executive Director of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities. He was assisted by Dr. Lawrence Rutter, Director of Membership Services of the International City Management Association. Other project assistance was provided by Dr. Lynn Miller, Coordinator for Urban Management Education at the International City Management Association; Mr. Alan Shark of the AASCU staff; and Mr. Frederick Sudermann, Director of Research and Sponsored Programs at Wichita State University, acting as principal project consultant.

The planning process consisted of several key phases including:

1. Organizing a planning task force of representatives from the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, the International City Management Association and the National Science Foundation.
2. Selecting key national groups, agencies, and organizations to be invited to participate in the planning effort.
3. Contacting representatives of the participating organizations for information and assistance and support.
4. Reviewing and analyzing information and material obtained from the participating organizations.
5. Arranging for the preparation of background papers.
6. Planning and conducting a pre-workshop agenda planning meeting.

The Planning Task Force: William Fulkerson, AASCU; Larry Rutter and Lynn Miller, ICMA; Frederick Sudermann, consultant; and Louis Higgs, NSF met in August of 1975 to plan program details and strategies for carrying out the planning project. This included the selection of organizations and agencies that would be invited to participate; identifying academicians and practitioners that would be asked to prepare background papers; preparing assignment schedules between AASCU and ICMA; and the development of a detailed calendar for the planning process including the January workshop. The principal consultant was assigned overall coordinating responsibility for the project activities.

Project Participants: Participating organizations were selected with the thought of involving organizations that represented practitioners and academicians, including city managers, county executives, local elected officials, state legislators and administrators, and college and university faculty members and chief administrators. In accordance with the proposal, the organizations invited to participate included the following:

International City Management Association
National Governors' Conference
National League of Cities
National Association of Counties
National Conference of State Legislatures
Council of State Governments
United States Conference of Mayors
American Society for Public Administration
National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration
American Association of State Colleges and Universities

American Council on Education
National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges
Association of American Colleges
American Association of Community and Junior Colleges
The Ford Foundation
The Lilly Endowment
U.S. Office of Education
The National Science Foundation
U.S. Civil Service Commission
U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
U.S. Department of Labor
U.S. Department of Transportation
U.S. Office of Management and Budget
National Training and Development Service

Each organization, association or agency was invited to participate by either Mark Keane, Executive Director of the International City Management Association, or Allan Ostar, the Executive Director of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities. As part of the invitation extended to the public interest groups and the higher education associations, their executive directors were asked to designate a staff member to work with members of the planning task force. All of the public interest groups, as well as the higher education associations, responded positively and participated in this program.

Staff Followup: As part of the planning activity, the designated staff representative of each public interest group, higher education association and the American Society for Public Administration and the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration, was contacted by members of the planning task force. The planning project was described and comments and suggestions were solicited. Specifically, they were asked to consider in terms of their organizations' own interest, resources and needs: (1) how important university resources were in solving state and local problems; (2) the major barriers to effective utilization of university resources in solving state and local problems; and (3) any specific questions, comments or suggestions as they considered the possible development of any continuing cooperative program in urban affairs and academic public service.

In discussions with the participating organizations a common willingness to help and participate was expressed. The public interest group recognized that higher education could play a larger role in helping the state, county and municipal governments and that there was a need to develop closer working relationships and foster a more realistic understanding between academicians and practitioners. There was general agreement that this lack of understanding was a major barrier to effective utilization of university resources to help solve state and local problems. This information was used extensively in the development of the agenda for the staff planning conference held on December 11, 1975.

Background Papers: Background papers were obtained from academicians and practitioners in local government which dealt not only with the elements and strategy for the development of the proposed cooperative action program but with the opportunities for and constraints affecting the involvement of higher education in an effective, broad range of academic public service programs. Five background papers were obtained as a part of the material developed for the project workshop.

These papers, which are included in the appendix of this report, not only provide good background information but also many excellent suggestions for positive action programs and organizational considerations that were reviewed in more detail during the project workshop. The papers were prepared by:

James Williams, City Manager, Santa Monica, California

James L. Caplinger, Public Affairs Consultant, Kalamazoo, Michigan

A. B. Biscoe, Jr., Associate Vice President for Public Affairs, University of Tennessee

Glenn Fisher, Wichita State University Regents Professor on Urban Affairs

John Osman, Brookings Institution Fellow

Staff Planning Conference: A meeting of staff members of the participating higher education associations and public interest groups was held on December 11, 1975. The purpose of the meeting was to review the planning effort to date and give each organization a final opportunity to consider items that they wished to have called to the attention of the January workshop participants including any suggestions in future action program development.

Organization representatives attending this meeting included:

Hubert R. Gallagher, Council of State Governments
Larry Rutter, International City Management Association
Lynn Miller, International City Management Association
Thomas Bruderle, National Association of Counties
Thad Beyle, National Governors Conference
Joe Mullin, National Conference of State Legislatures
Larry Williams, National League of Cities
Roger Yarrington, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges
Richard Humphrey, American Council on Education
Tom Parker, American Society for Public Administration

George Maharay, American Society for Public Administration
F. L. Wormald, Association of American Colleges
Walter Broadnax, National Association of Schools of
Public Affairs and Administration
Sue Fratkin, National Association of State Universities
and Land-Grant Colleges
John McGwire, National Science Foundation
Bob Luke, National Training & Development Service
John Osman, Brookings Institution
Fred Sudermann, Project Consultant
William M. Fulkerson, Jr., American Association of State
Colleges and Universities
Alan Shark, American Association of State Colleges and
Universities
A. B. Biscoe, University of Tennessee

This meeting, chaired by the Project Director, Dr. Fulkerson, considered a broad range of possible organizational features and functional activities for an Office of Urban Affairs and Public Service. Discussion centered upon the relationship of such an office and any action projects to the activities and responsibilities of the individual educational organizations and public interest groups present.

Consensus was reached to the effect that higher education could be more responsive, through training, applied research and services, to meeting the needs of state and local governments. It was further agreed that: (1) a program based on a continuing association of these organizations could improve higher education's ability to react to these governmental needs for technical assistance, applied research and training; (2) such a program could assist in the identification of national needs and the development of improved federal agency response to them; (3) such a program could foster improved relationships between colleges and universities and state, municipal, and county governments; (4) there are some services or new processes and mechanisms that collaborative programs could foster that will provide new opportunities for improved academic public service responses by higher education that are not presently available or effectively utilized.

With this consensus, the group reviewed a number of general goals and objectives that might be undertaken through a cooperative effort coordinated by an office operated by the American Association of State Colleges and Universities representing the participating educational associations. In addition, a number of specific action programs that such an office might undertake were also discussed as possible agenda items for the January workshop.

Beyond the general consensus that there was a need for much more interaction between the groups involved and the constituents they represent which would foster a better understanding of the needs of the state and local governmental agencies and the resources that higher education might effectively apply to those needs, no agreement was reached regarding specific action programs. However, it was agreed that the January workshop agenda preparation should be completed by the Planning Task Force under the Project Director's supervision.

The Planning Workshop: With the results of the staff conference and other information obtained in individual staff conversations, the Project Director prepared the planning workshop agenda based on the following general questions upon which much of the December 11th Conference discussion was centered:

1. Do education associations agree that there is a need to continue to identify additional methods and resources to improve their ability to serve state, municipal and county governments through applied research, training the technical assistance?

2. Do public interest groups agree that there is a need for higher education to better serve state and local government and do they agree to work toward encouraging the use of these educational resources by their memberships at the state and local level?

3. Should there be a mechanism to motivate and encourage further cooperative endeavors between public interest groups and higher education associations? Specifically, will the associations' representatives attending the workshop endorse higher education's interest in developing an Office of Urban Affairs and Public Service and support the search for resources required for such an effort?

The final agenda agreed to by the task force is appended to this report along with the workshop proceedings, background papers and other related material. Although a review of the appendix is suggested for a complete understanding of what transpired, the major points, suggestions, and recommendations offered during the workshop are summarized in the conclusions of this report.

Conclusions

All of the major conditions of the National Science Foundation Grant to conduct a planning project designed to develop the basic framework for an operational plan for cooperative action programs in urban affairs and public service have been met.

With the cooperation of the participating organizations and their representatives, and with the grateful assistance of Graham Watt and the National Training Development Service, there appears to be consensus that the project activity outlined in the proposal ahould be continued and could be implemented effectively. The project task force was encouraged with the interest expressed by the participants and their support of follow-up activities that will improve higher education's ability to respond more effectively to the needs of state, municipal and county officials.

The workshop participants endorsed the AASCU proposal to create an Office of Urban Affairs and Public Service that would contain organizational elements insuring continued interaction between higher educational associations and public interest groups. In addition, the workshop group expressed support for efforts to seek three- to five-year funding of such an office. As the lead educational association for this effort, AASCU has assumed responsibility for the development of proposals with the assistance of the ICMA as the lead public interest group.

Specific organizational patterns and action programs to be proposed will be gleaned from the information and experience obtained throughout this planning process and will be coordinated with the participating organizations or groups so as to insure maximum continued interaction and minimum duplication.

Although any future organizational efforts and action programs will depend upon the resources that are made available, it is envisioned that an office will be created within the AASCU structure that will receive program and policy guidance through an advisory board made up of members from the participating educational associations and public interest groups. The office will operate under a general set of goals and objectives that include:

1. Establishing new links and fostering cooperative and functioning relationships among national organizations with public service interests, higher education associations and councils, and appropriate U.S. Government agencies and private foundations.

2. Facilitating cooperative operational relationships among state and local governmental personnel, individuals in the private sector, and academic personnel from universities, colleges and community colleges located in the service area.

3. Identifying alternatives for the modification of university, college and community teaching, applied research and public service roles and related policies to more effectively mobilize higher education's resources for contributions to short- and long-range solutions to urban problems.

4. Facilitating and evaluating innovative program developments and strategies—particularly joint cooperative projects—among the governmental, private and academic sectors.

5. Encouraging the expansion of the base of knowledge and the improvement of methodological tools in the fields of urban studies and public affairs.

6. Facilitating the study and development of policies and priorities for the future involvement of universities, colleges and community colleges in local urban problem areas and academic public service.

7. Sponsoring or encouraging meetings, seminars, and conferences on selected topics of mutual interest for the national and local groups, organizations and institutions and individuals given above.

8. Disseminating model case studies or inventories of innovative programs and strategies with a history of success. This could include publishing a newsletter to systematically communicate up-to-date information from the above activities.

Program areas that surfaced throughout this planning effort, including the workshop, that will be considered as a basis for possible specific action projects centered around the need for continued interaction and communication between the groups involved and their constituencies; the dissemination of information regarding governmental needs and educational resources that can be applied to meet those needs; mechanisms for furthering the understanding of each others organizational and operational restraints and capabilities; and the general improvement of communications and interaction that will further stimulate cooperation and support of mutual program interests at the national and local level.

Based upon the discoveries made and encouragement received throughout this planning effort, the AASCU will be preparing proposal(s) to federal agencies and foundations requesting support for an Office of Urban Affairs and Public Services.

APPENDIX A

EXAMPLE OF LETTER SENT TO EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATIONS

Dr. Roger W. Heyns
President
American Council on Education
One Dupont Circle, Suite 800
Washington, D.C.

Dear Roger:

The American Association of State Colleges and Universities, in cooperation with the International City Management Association and with the support of you and the other higher education associations, has been awarded a grant by the National Science Foundation for "A Planning Project to Develop a Cooperative Action Program in Urban Affairs and Academic Public Service." A summary of the project proposal which you reviewed in June is enclosed. The project has been funded for a six-month period and will provide the opportunity to review various opportunities and strategies for future cooperative arrangements among public interest groups, foundations, government agencies, and higher education as it relates to academic public service and urban affairs.

Plans are being made for the preparation of several concept papers and for holding a number of planning meetings leading toward a Task Force workshop scheduled for January 7 and 8, 1976 in Washington, D.C. It is our hope that you and one of your presidents who is especially interested in this program will be able to join the Executive Directors and presidents of other higher education, state, and local government associations at the January meeting. A list of the invited organizations follows this letter. Please let us know who your presidential representative will be and whether you will be able to attend the meeting.

Thank you for your support in this important cooperative arrangement. As time for planning is short, we would like to hear from you at your earliest convenience. Bill Fulkerson

APPENDIX B

EXAMPLE OF LETTER SENT TO PUBLIC INTEREST GROUPS AND FEDERAL AGENCIES

Mr. Brevard Crihfield
Executive Director
Council of State Governments
P.O. Box 11910
Iron Works Pike
Lexington, Ky. 40511

Dear Mr. Crihfield:

Over the past few years several attempts to develop models of university assistance to urban governments have ranged in results from modest successes to substantial failures. Some critics have heralded the outcomes as demonstration that universities lack the will and/or the ability to be useful in this field.

University associations, such as the American Council on Education, the Ford Foundation, National League of Cities, and ICMA to name a few, have all been involved in such efforts. Despite the lack of many clear successes, it is worth exploring these efforts to determine what valid approaches there are to determining what university resources are applicable to urban problem-solving.

ICMA is involved with AASCU, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, in a planning grant to explore what approaches are appropriate to involvement of public interest groups with state college presidents. We are convinced that the AASCU organization is committed and has resources which increase the likelihood of cooperation. We would like to encourage your involvement in the planning effort to explore university resources in helping local governments.

On January 6 and 7 we are planning a workshop in Washington, D.C., to involve educational associations, public interest groups, selected federal agencies and private foundations in determining the potential for coordinated programs.

Plans call for preliminary staff discussion in November to lay the groundwork. What we hope to develop is a working relationship between university presidents and local government leaders for future action programs. To help determine the priorities of your organization in the program, would you designate one of your staff to represent you? Lynn Miller, ICMA's Urban Management Education Program Coordinator, and Fred Sudermann, AASCU's representative, will then contact him. Let me know who that person is, and we will see that he gets appropriate materials on the program, and the November planning meeting.

It is my hope that you and one of your board or committee members especially interested in this program will be able to attend the January meeting with the university presidents.

I think the circumstances argue well for achieving a consensus in this group. The need for developing a working relationship between public interest groups and university presidents parallels several recent developments. ICMA/NASPAA's Urban Management Education Program provides practitioner input into university curriculum. In addition, Alan Campbell, as president of the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration, is spending the year in Washington, and will participate in the program. The potential for involvement of the public interest groups is worth exploring.

Sincerely,

Mark E. Keane,
Executive Director

APPENDIX C

EXAMPLE OF LETTER SENT TO MEMBERS OF DECEMBER CONFERENCE

On December 11, 1975 from 12:00 to 2:30 p.m. you are invited to a meeting for key staff members who are participating in AASCU's and ICMA's Cooperative Action Program in Urban Affairs and Academic Public Service. A buffet lunch will be served at our meeting which is located at the American Home Economics Building, 2010 Massachusetts Avenue.

The purpose of this meeting is to brief the designated staffs of the participating organizations as to the progress to date of our project, as well as to plan ahead for the January 6th and 7th workshop meeting.

This will be an important meeting which is necessary in helping to insure the success of our project. We hope you will be able to join us. Please contact Alan Shark at 293-7070 for a R.S.V.P.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

William M. Fulkerson, Jr.
Associate Executive Director

WMF:t

APPENDIX D

AASCU-ICMA

Urban Affairs and Academic Public Service

December 11, 1975

Staff Planning Meeting Agenda

The purpose of this meeting is to review the planning program in final preparation of the workshop agenda and provide an opportunity for each participating agency and organization to provide comments and suggestions for consideration in future program development.

1. Introduction
2. General review and report by the planning task force of planning efforts to date.
3. Consideration of over-all goals and objectives.
4. Review of possible program elements (workshop agenda).
5. Consideration of organizational arrangements.
6. Other related recommendations and suggestions including possibilities for support.

APPENDIX E

AASCU - ICMA

SUMMARY

URBAN AFFAIRS AND ACADEMIC PUBLIC SERVICE

STAFF MEETING OF PARTICIPATING GROUPS
December 11, 1975
Washington, D.C.

Nineteen staff persons representing Higher Education and Public Interest Associations met on December 11th to discuss and review AASCU's and ICMA's Planning Project to establish a Program in Urban Affairs and Academic Public Service.

The meeting began with an introduction to the project and in particular how AASCU became involved and assumed a lead role in this endeavor. ICMA's interest and co-sponsorship was also elaborated upon.

Discussion then focused on the review of the planning task force and the planning efforts to date were reported. Consideration was then given to the project's overall stated goals and objectives. To help move the meeting along, a questionnaire was developed that was designed to help the participants focus in on specific action programs while measuring the individual's perceptions and concern for a program. While some individuals found the questionnaire long and too specific, there was however, unanimous consent on the following points:

Presently, university resources are important to solving state and local problems.

A program based on some continued association of the organizations participating in this planning effort could improve higher education's ability to react to the needs of state and local governments for technical assistance, applied research or training.

Such a program could assist in the identification of national needs and the development of improved federal agency responses to those needs.

Such a program could foster improved relationships between colleges and universities, and state and local governments.

There are some areas of services or new processes or mechanisms that collaborative programs might foster that will provide new opportunities for improved academic public service responses by higher education that are not presently available or effectively utilized.

Establish new links and foster cooperative functioning relationships among national organizations with public service interests, higher education associations and councils, and appropriate U.S. Government agencies and private foundations.

Facilitate cooperative operational relationships among state and local governmental personnel, individuals in the private sector, and academic personnel from universities, colleges and community colleges located in the service area.

Develop strategies for the continued involvement of the key groups in providing advice and support for Urban Affairs and Academic Public Service program planning and implementation at state, local and national level.

Discussion also centered around the issue of what should be on the agenda for the Urban Workshop meeting on January 6th and 7th. In addition time was spent trying to conceptualize the overall goals of the project and what could realistically be accomplished at this January Urban Workshop. Using existing resources among the participating groups was also mentioned.

There was unanimous consent on another statement on the questionnaire in which everyone disagreed with the statement:

University resources are being used as effectively as possible in helping state and local governmental officials.

At the conclusion of the meeting it was agreed that the participating members would have an opportunity to respond to an agenda, prepared by AASCU, prior to the January meeting.

APPENDIX F

AASCU - ICMA

DECEMBER 11th MEETING

PARTICIPANTS

Council of State Governments 1225 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 202/785-0377	Hubert A. Gallagher
International City Management Assn. 1140 Connecticut Ave., N.W. Washington, D.C. 202/293-2200	Larry Rutter Lynn Miller
National Association of Counties 1735 New York Ave., N.W. Washington, D.C. 202/785-9577	Thomas Bruderle
National Governors Conference 1150 - 17th Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 202/785-8840	Thad Beyle
National League of Cities 1620 "I" Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 202/293-7300	Larry Williams
Amer. Assn. of Community & Junior Colleges One Dupont Circle #410 Washington, D.C. 202/293-7050	Roger Yarrington
Amer. Assn. of State Colleges & Universities One Dupont Circle #700 Washington, D.C. 202/293-7070	William Fulkerson Fred Sudermann Alan Shark
American Council on Education One Dupont Circle #800 Washington, D.C. 202/833-4700	Richard Humphrey

APPENDIX G

EXAMPLE OF WORKSHOP INVITATION

Mr. John Simmons
Department of Housing & Urban Development
451 7th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20410

Dear John:

As Project Director of the Urban Affairs and Academic Public Service Planning Project, I am pleased to reaffirm your invitation to participate in the Project Workshop on January 6th and 7th that was extended to you in a letter from Mark Keane on October 20, 1975.

The workshop will be held at the Washington Hilton Hotel beginning at 5:00 o'clock on January 6, extending through lunch on January 7.

This workshop is the final step in our planning project conducted by the American Association of State Colleges and Universities and the International City Management Association under the auspices of the National Science Foundation. We hope that the workshop will provide guidance and assistance in determining possibilities for possible cooperative arrangements and action programs designed to improve higher education's responses to the problems faced by local and state governments as reflected in the agenda and workshop materials.

As noted in the planning proposal, the strongest prospect for accomplishing this task appeared to be in forming a group of key individuals representing public interest associations, federal agencies, private foundations and higher education associations and councils in order to build the foundation for a cooperative action program of academic public service to state and local governments.

Throughout this planning project attempts have been made to determine the needs and interest of the participating organizations or associations, including the determination of specific programs that through a cooperative mechanism would improve higher education's involvement in public service activities.

WORKSHOP

PROCEEDINGS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

WORKSHOP PROCEEDINGS

INTRODUCTION i.

AGENDA ii.

EDITED PROCEEDINGS 1 - 47

WORKSHOP APPENDIX

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS i.

BACKGROUND PAPERS AND AUTHORS 1 - 36

SUMMARY 37

INTRODUCTION

This workshop was the final step in a planning project conducted by the American Association of State Colleges and Universities and the International City Management Association under the auspices of the National Science Foundation. The purpose of the planning effort was to determine the feasibility of developing and operating a cooperative action program in urban affairs and public service designed to improve higher education's response to the problems faced by municipal, county and state governments.

In summary, the workshop participants agreed that some continued mechanism that would encourage additional cooperative efforts between public interest groups and higher educational associations is desirable. It was further agreed that the public interest groups would support and assist the higher educational associations' efforts to develop an Office of Urban Affairs and Public Service and that the American Association of State Colleges and Universities would be the lead educational agency in this effort.

Armed with a number of specific suggestions for action programs and organizational arrangements obtained throughout the project planning efforts including this workshop, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities is pursuing three to five year support of continued cooperative efforts.

A WORKSHOP TO CONSIDER THE DEVELOPMENT OF A COOPERATIVE ACTION PROGRAM IN URBAN AFFAIRS AND ACADEMIC PUBLIC SERVICE

Washington Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C.
January 6 and 7, 1976

AGENDA

January 6, 1976

5:00 - 6:00 PM Social Hour - Hemisphere Room

6:00 - 8:00 PM Dinner

INTRODUCTION

Clark Ahlberg: Workshop Chairman, President of Wichita State University, Chairman of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities Urban Affairs Committee

COMMENTS

Mark Keane: Executive Director, International City Management Association

Allan W. Ostar: Executive Director, American Association of State Colleges and Universities

January 7, 1976

8:30 - 9:00 AM Coffee and Danish - Thoroughbred Room

9:00 - 9:30 CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS LEADING TO THE PLANNING GRANT

Roger Heyns: President, American Council on Education

Larry Rutter: Director of Membership Services, International City Management Association

William Fulkerson: Associate Executive Director, American Association of State Colleges and Universities

For the purposes of the following agenda, Academic Public Service can be defined as a two-way process between universities and state and local governments involving time, facilities and resources used in meeting public needs.

Discussion Items

1. Do public interest groups and higher education associations as represented here, agree to support academic public service activities which may better serve state, county and local governments in solving public problems? These activities include but are not limited to the following:

   (a) the impact of federal revenue sharing on state, county and local units.

   (b) assisting governmental units in planning processes in various substantive areas such as public health.

   (c) assisting governmental units in program evaluation of governmental services.

   (d) assisting governmental units in assessing the fiscal capacity of state and local units in deficit financing.

   (e) evaluating the equity of services provided by governmental units.

   (f) assisting in analyzing collective bargaining problems.

   (g) assisting in analyzing policy-making and decision-making processes in the governmental units.

   (h) assisting in evaluating capacity building and governmental units.

   (i) assisting in identifying and evaluating current academic service programs.

   (j) assisting in identifying appropriate institutional resources in higher education associations and public interest groups.

   (k) assisting in identifying appropriate institutional resources, colleges and universities, and in governmental units.

EDITED PROCEEDINGS OF THE AASCU-ICMA WORKSHOP ON URBAN AFFAIRS AND ACADEMIC PUBLIC SERVICE CONDUCTED IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

January 6 and 7, 1976

Opening Session
January 6, 1976, Evening
Dr. Clark Ahlberg, Chairman

Clark Ahlberg:

All of us are not uniform in our knowledge of how this meeting came about. As a prelude to our working session which begins tomorrow morning, I would like to offer some background of this particular project and how it got where it is today.

The American Association of State Colleges and Universities has about 320 collegiate institutions as members. Many of them had their beginning as state teachers colleges. Only in the past decade or two have these schools become comprehensive colleges or universities. These institutions enroll some 2.2 million students. More than half are enrolled in institutions that happen to be located in cities and most of these institutions remain predominantly undergraduate institutions. Relatively few of them are what we could call sophisticated complex graduate institutions. There are a number which are members of National Associations for Schools of Public Affairs and Administration and have graduate programs in public administration or public affairs. It is also characteristic of these institutions that a very significant proportion of their student body, particularly their full-time student body, are first generation college students. There are students in these institutions in large number from minority groups. There is a fair emphasis in these institutions on a vocational or job preparation kind of education.

If one were to generalize about AASCU institutions, the faculty themselves, in contrast, are not faculties who have long experience in public affairs education, public administration, or extensive experience in working cooperatively with state and local governments. In many cities and states, these relationships have been well developed by the state universities represented by the American Association of Land-Grant Universities.

A number of years ago, the Urban Affairs Committee was created by AASCU to give some direction to the urban education needs faced by member institutions which were located and conducting their educational operation in an urban center. The theory behind the creation of this committee was not only the need to build communication networks in state and local governments and to increase the effectiveness of the institutions serving these state and local governments, but also to improve the quality of the undergraduate and graduate educational program by involving them in a relationship of service or consultation or research or internships in state and local governments. It was reciprocal from the beginning.

The AASCU staff devoted to this is small. We did have an office. We published a newsletter which had some general acceptance in higher education, and a great many institutions other than our own members requested it. This was a way of trying to share with the least successful of these institutions the successful experience of other association institutions. Financed initially by grants from the Sears Foundation, it also included a program called mini-grants (the amount of money involved was usually very small). Nevertheless, the mini-grants were very useful in helping these institutions initiate a public affairs type of education effort.

With the passing of time and changes in the membership in the organization, it was part of our concern that we try to develop some kind of ties to the national public interest organizations with Washington headquarters and their state counterparts with which our institutions, in the past, have had very little relationship. We felt this was the missing gap in the experience and the input in the educational program of our institutions.

Simultaneously, we began to look for new sources of funding for a staff office we had established in the hopes that it could be more useful to our association. The American Council on Education announced that it was bowing out of its urban leadership role in higher education. Allan Ostar, our executive director, approached ACE and talked about our own interest in this field. Somewhat later I talked with ACE Vice President Steve Bailey on the same lines and we succeeded in securing a commitment from the American Council on Education. Basically, it was that if the American Association of State Colleges and Universities institutions were interested in developing their concern with urban affairs and public affairs education and could develop a staff and secure the cooperation and participation of the other higher educational associations on a national basis, the American Council on Education would look to us for leadership and would support our efforts to fund this kind of program, providing it was broadly based and representative. ACE also agreed with us that it was highly desirable to include the public affairs organization represented here this evening. From the very beginning, this was one of our objectives.

A few of us - on a part-time basis - and the staff in our Washington office have spent the last 12 to 14 months calling on organizations represented here tonight discussing with you your potential interest in participating or collaborating in the development of such a staff and organization.

With this changing base of support we also sought some financing which made possible this meeting, namely the National Science Foundation. Its support and the support of ACE has resulted in broadening the concept that we originally started with in AASCU.

Along with this development our focus began to change.

Our focus, in part, is how can an urban staff office located within the American Association of State Colleges and Universities be made to serve as the link between all the higher education, post-secondary education and public interest groups here in the national capital? How can such an organization secure and improve cooperation in joint programs development and design, to improve the usefulness of universities and colleges and junior colleges, etc. to state and local governments? How can we use such an office to work toward removing the barriers to effective collaboration which was so well discussed in the papers which have been prepared as background for this conference? How can such a staff improve the quality of public service education at the undergraduate and junior college levels as well as the graduate levels? And how can the staff become useful to organizations such as the National Science Foundation, the United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Department of Labor, to mention only a few, in carrying out their public service and education roles and in devising ways in which we can work more effectively together to promote public affairs education in the United States? These are the kinds of considerations which we wish to focus on tomorrow.

Our current purpose and the task of tomorrow's meetings is to decide if this group, broadly representative of public interest and higher educational associations, can agree that such a staff and some advisory policy council representative of all or most of the organizations and groups present this evening could serve a useful and meaningful purpose. If we agree, what other functions and structures need to be added to this concept in order to make an achievement of these kinds of goals or objectives feasible and possible? Can we collaborate through designated representatives to flesh out the structure or purpose of the proposed staff and the council? Certainly we cannot do that in a definitive way in a half-day meeting.

Finally, can we also agree to collaborate to seek three-to five-year funding to support such an organizational effort on a pilot or experimental basis?

I've oversimplified a very complex and sophisticated problem, a problem that many of us have worked with over the years in the various organizations which we represent today. It's equally important that we realize that in the face of these complexities to become paralyzed is also to accomplish nothing. At the recent national meeting of the AASCU and its Urban Affairs Committee, we agreed that this is a suitable model. It's time for us to act. We believe it to be in the interest of our kinds of institutions and hope you will join us in trying to develop some kind of a program that will serve the interest and needs of your institution.

Dr. Ahlberg introduced Mark Keane, Executive Director of the International City Management Association.

Mark Keane:

These occasions when you're sitting at a table next to people you don't see often, there's an opportunity for touching all kinds of bases that you haven't thought of for quite awhile. And in sitting next to Clark Ahlberg, president of Wichita State University, who I've only come to know in the last year and a half, I began to think a little about Wichita. I started my career in local government as an assistant to the city manager in that city. We had excellent relationships with Wichita University which at that time was a city university, partly supported by the taxes which we raised.

We had in the University a gentleman named Dr. Hugo Wall, who just died within the last two weeks. He was not only a distinguished academic of high reputation in the academic community but he was one who knew how to reach in the City Hall and to work with us on the grubbier details of local government management. For me he was kind of a model of what we would hope to find in the universities in establishing this linkage with city hall.

Some years later when I went to Tucson as city manager, one of the first visits I made was out to the University of Arizona to meet with Dr. Richard Harbell, the president of the university, to talk with him about how the university and the city might work together. We had so many problems in Tucson from growth and almost everything associated with it; housing, and a horrible problem of water supply. I knew I needed all the help I could get. And the University of Arizona was most responsive at that time. A special committee of research directors from various departments of the University who had any interest in local government affairs was established. Dr. Dave Bingham was appointed the liaison coordinator with city hall. Many of the things we accomplished in the city were due directly to the assistance we got from the University.

This morning I kicked off another advisory group meeting which, in some respects, is similar. We are in a process of developing a new "green book." There are 15 textbooks published by ICMA starting with first in 1935 which are explicitly related to managing local government including policy administration, public works, public health, library administration, personnel planning, and so on. This new book we are starting is in human services. There isn't any good textbook in managing human services in local government. So we brought together a group to help us do it. Why is this important to you at all? We sell 40,000 of these green books a year, all aimed at practitioners. But interestingly, approximately 80 per cent of those 40,000 books go to colleges and universities. The colleges and universities are much more interested today in training young people for the profession in local government management. These books are used because they have the ring of reality to them as a way of helping students understand the practical problems of managing the various aspects of local government.

This committee meeting today on that green book has a relatively easy job compared to yours. Its members have to advise and counsel on how that book should be outlined and its select writers. What you have is much more intangible. It's been talked about so much and with so little apparent success, as pretty well documented by Bill Pendleton in his recent papers.

The International City Management Association has shared in this frustration over the years of trying to work with universities and trying to help establish the linkage between the practicing professional and the teaching or research side of the university. There have been successes. The first long term director of ICMA was Dr. Clarence Ridley. He did a great deal, many years ago, to develop relationships between the practicing professional and universities.

What the Department of Housing and Urban Affairs has done in providing substantial grants to ICMA and the National Association of Schools of Public

Administration and Affairs took a great deal of perception and a great deal of courage to invest so much in the projects which really have only a long range pay off. They are aimed at the basic problem of bringing the academic community and the practitioner together.

The National Training and Development Service, headed by Graham Watt, is another institution which was conceptualized and talked about many years ago. But it too could get no funding or support. It could not come into existence until somehow the climate seemed right. With the cooperation of Joe Robertson and the Intergovernmental Personnel Act, the Civil Service Commission and the Ford Foundation, it now is existing as a strong institution between the practitioner and the university. The climate seems to me particularly good for you as you approach this problem tomorrow.

Dr. Ahlberg introduced Allan Ostar, executive director, American Association of State Colleges and Universities.

Allan Ostar:

The strength of organizations like ours, the Land-Grant Association, Junior College Association, American Council on Education and the Association of American Colleges, is the commitment and activity of its members. Otherwise, these organizations would not exist.

Now we're going to turn things around a little bit. No one has introduced Clark Ahlberg and I think it's very important for this meeting that we know a little bit about Clark, other than the fact that he's president of Wichita State University. He brings something quite unique to his role as the convener of this meeting and the stimulus behind the project. Clark has a long background in the area of academic public service. He spent about twenty years in the area of public service culminating as director of the budget for the State of New York when Governor Harriman was in Albany. Those were the days when New York was in a good position fiscally, and you see what has happened since Clark went into higher education. Now of course we're expecting Clark to perform the same kind of miracle for higher education as we see the clouds beginning to form over us. In looking over Clark's academic background I was struck by the fact that he is also a product of Syracuse University and the Maxwell School and has a doctorate from that institution.

In our building at One Dupont Circle, Steve Bailey's presence is well known as Executive Vice President of the American Council on Education. Steve and Roger Heyns, who is the president, brought with them to the American Council some new perspectives to the way higher education can organize itself and deal with national policy issues. One Dupont Circle houses a large number of higher education associations. The Kellogg Foundation gave a fairly substantial amount of money to buy that building with the idea of bringing all the higher education associations into one building to improve communication. Just putting people in one building doesn't really solve that problem.

What Roger and Steve try to do is to identify the roles that the various associations might play in a cooperative manner. So, instead of each association going its own way we can identify some common problems, common areas that one of the organizations will take responsibility for and enlist the cooperation of the other associations in dealing with these problems.

Each of the associations has one or more responsibilities along this line. We happen to have two of them. One of them is the Servicemen's Opportunity College which we do in cooperation with the Junior College Association. The other is in the area of Urban Affairs and Academic Public Service.

We've been greatly impressed and pleased by the cooperation of ICMA, particularly, the work of Mark Keane and Bill Besuden, Larry Rutter and Lynn Miller, and of Graham Watt of National Training and Development Service. This has really started off with ICMA acting as the leader agency for the various public interest groups. We're acting as the lead agency for the higher education group.

We're grateful to Clark Ahlberg for loaning us Fred Sudermann of his staff, who has done considerable work in trying to bridge the gap between the various elements here, and at the same time shuffle back and forth between here and Wichita. Underlining what Mark Keane said, we've never had a time that is more appropriate to bring these segments together to do something constructive.

A few years ago, when we started our own Urban Affairs program, we looked at the problems of the city and at the institutions located in cities. It seemed perfectly obvious that the resources of the institution were here to solve the problems of the city. All we had to do was challenge the institutions to respond to those problems. However, our institutions of higher education did not respond as effectively as we had hoped. Remember in those days institutions were still growing very rapidly and funds for growth and development were more plentiful than they are today. Also, the reward system in academe was geared to individual faculty members making their mark in the chosen professions, rather than having a real commitment to the institution, or to help solve the problem of their communities.

Self-interest is a great motivator. Right now, higher education institutions are beginning to see some clouds forming. They see that the number of traditional students on the horizon will be declining. The institutions that will survive and prosper are those that will be responsive in seeking out new ways of being of service to whatever constituency they choose to serve. Now maybe we are at a time and place when we can identify clearly and sharply the problems that need to be addressed and identify the resources of the institutions that can work those out.

We need to approach this in a different way than we ever approached any problems in the past - in a spirit of genuine cooperation with you as partners in the enterprise rather than higher education sitting back self-sufficiently in its ivory tower deciding what it wants to work on and when it wants to work on it.

If we do this in a partnership relationship, something very positive will come out of it. And we can certainly look forward to having that happen.

Ahlberg: I'm tempted to comment on an event I participated in as an observer at Syracuse a number of years ago, back before the American Society of Public Administration was formed. I remember being assembled on one of the many occasions in which the then Dean William E. Mosher assembled the graduate students. And, believe me, we were assemblable. He came back from Washington to tell that there had been an agreement reached to found this new society: the American Society of Public Administration. He talked with us at some length about the agenda that these men had envisioned for this organization. I had a feeling that nobody knew then how meaningful the American Society of Public Administration would come to be for public service education and for public service people in general and for raising standards and sights and generally moving the country forward. What Willy was really interested in doing at that time, however, was enlisting us all as charter members.

There's no one in this meeting who has that power over anyone else. Potentially that is what we're about and what we may create may come to that with the passing of time. Certainly, not immediately. But real movement toward improving public service education in the United States and for hopefully making higher education of greater usefulness to the public service is the agenda we all share in the various organizations in which we are participants, in which we are employed and work.

This is the time for other new organizational innovations to take place and be born, and to come into operation. This is our challenge for tomorrow's workshop.

Workshop Session
January 7, 1976, Morning

Clark Ahlberg:

Last evening in reiterating some of the history of the project we are here to discuss at this workshop, Allan Ostar, Mark Keane and I alluded to how it developed and how we became involved in it. A key organization guiding us toward today has been the American Council on Education and its president, Mr. Roger Heyns. We're very pleased that he would take time from his very busy schedule to be with us and speak to us from the point of view of the ACE regarding this particular project and its overall objectives.

Roger Heyns:

The educational associations here in Washington have become increasingly confident about the concept of the chosen instrument, or lead agency, because our individual resources as institutions and as associations are limited. Because many of our problems are common and because it's terribly wasteful for us to duplicate our efforts, we have increasingly sought to allocate responsibility for particular endeavors. For developing and executing programs of interest to us all, the ACE, under a grant from the Sloan Foundation for three years, had an office of Urban Affairs under the direction of Martin Jenkins. He gave it excellent leadership and stimulated an enormous amount of interest in universities in the problems of the urban community. When that grant terminated, we agreed among ourselves, because of an interest and because of the intensity of its previous effort under the leadership of Clark Ahlberg among others, that the American Association of State Colleges and Universities should be the association to attempt to formulate, develop, define and execute a program relating the higher education community to the problems of the urban area.

When we agree to such an arrangement there are understandings on all sides, understandings that are important, particularly to those of you who are outside the academic community who have responsibilities for important areas of our country. We agree among ourselves to concentrate our efforts, not to establish competing efforts, and to support through our resources and those of the institutions in our memberships the efforts that are made. Now there is a corresponding obligation on the part of a lead agency, or the lead association, namely that it will extend its regard and interest to associations that lie outside its direct membership. I can speak for all the associations, certainly for all of us in the Council, when I thank AASCU for its willingness to accept this responsibility. We don't have any trouble pledging our efforts to continue to be helpful. You, in turn, can safely assume that when you turn to this association for help you are really turning to us all. And when you are giving this project advice, you are indeed advising us all, and when, in turn, this program is defined you can count on us all. That is the major impact of what otherwise might be called by some the tedious history of association affairs. The important thing is that this is our effort to establish a checkpoint, a point of contact with an organization that will assume responsibility for bringing you into contact with the resources of the institutions. All of this, of course, is to emphasize that we do, indeed, believe that this relationship is a terribly needful one. It's a very difficult one. Many of the papers that you have before you pointed that out.

There is one set of observations on the urban side and another set of observations on the university side that make this, perhaps, a propitious moment for taking another look and entertaining the possibility that more can be achieved.

First of all, there has been an enormous increase in the sophistication and training and professionalism of the people who now have responsibilities in our cities. From your training, your experience with the educational institutions, you have a more realistic fix on what institutions can and cannot do. You know something of how we operate, what our foibles are and what our strengths are. As a consequence, you are more likely neither to expect too little or too much. Corresponding to this, on the university side, there is a growing number of scholars and scientists on the college and university campuses who have acquired a greater humility about what they know on the one hand and a greater appreciation for what the practitioner knows on the other, than was formerly the case.

And secondly, I think there is an intrinsic interest in many fields in applied problems and in the importance of the applied setting for advancing knowledge and for training. This makes matters more auspicious in general terms than ever before. It ought to make us more willing than we have otherwise been to make another pass at this very difficult problem.

Clark Ahlberg:

Looking back over the history of higher education organizations in Washington, it's possible to observe that this kind of cooperation has not always characterized higher education organizations perhaps any more than other organizations representing far-flung national areas such as the ICMA. Two of the people that carry the burden of this for the two sponsoring organizations have been Bill Fulkerson of the AASCU and Larry Rutter of ICMA.

Bill Fulkerson:

I wanted to take this opportunity to thank the National Science Foundation not only for the grant to help with this activity but for the interest NSF has had in getting these two particular types of groups or institutions together to talk about what kinds of things can be done. The activity and the involvement between the two groups has been an experience which I have found to be most beneficial. The obvious desire to try to get something done for their institutions, for their particular service groups, I found to be very impressive. Thanks to the National Science Foundation for providing us with this opportunity and hopefully we will be able to further it.

Dr. John Osman, fellow of the Brookings Institution, chaired the first session.

John Osman:

Everyone here has earned the privilege of presenting a paper or maybe a half a dozen or dozen papers. Some of you have already written half a dozen books dealing with the matter that is before us. So the selection of five individuals to prepare these papers is simply to put some perspective before you.

My perspective is basically one of a corporal or a platoon sergeant. Most of you are field marshals, or generals, or, at least, colonels working in nice offices. Most of my association with this program has been out in the community. In this case, Jim Williams, the city manager of Santa Monica, would claim that he, too, works in the fox holes.

We do have a different set of perspectives.

We're going to ask our paper presenters to take no more than 5 or 6 minutes and then give you an opportunity to talk with us about the papers.

I see the problem as basically an intellectual problem. Consequently it falls upon the shoulders of the institutions of higher education in this country to do something about it. Whether you deal with epistemology of translating knowledge and research into policies and programs or whether you're actually dealing with the methodology of it, it seems to me that fundamentally it is a concern of our colleges and our universities to make that point. The other important point from my perspective is that it does look as if we need a new paradigm with which to work when we deal with urban affairs in this country. The paradigm with which we have been preparing the program seems no longer relevant. Yesterday's Washington Post had a rather long editorial talking about the necessity of some sort of a national growth policy. The data from which this editorial was derived are relevant data, but yet the interpretation of these data seems to me to be erroneous. It's not so much just a change in the population structure of the country or the movement of people in this country as the editorial was proposing. We are simply spreading people out and our cities are tending to erode.

A tremendous amount of attention has been focused on New York City in the last few months. This has been very interesting to see just what insights we could get about a real case study that we have before us. For months there has not been a tremendous amount of illumination in this particular matter. It is interesting that right now, as far as we can make out, the role of the city in this country is not being considered. I recall years ago having read the history of the Russian Revolution by Leon Trotsky and being struck with the fact that Trotsky in the first four or five chapters of that history of the Russian Revolution attributes it to the failure of the Russian city. He points out that in Western Europe and the U.S. the city had succeeded in doing certain kinds of things for its people. It had generated social change, created employment. And if you read Trotsky's even more interesting series of essays called 1905 you'll find that he was one of the very close students of the role of the city.

I am suggesting here that the time has come for us to seriously take consideration of what the role of the city is in the American society. I was arguing that it was the institution of higher education, the colleges and universities that are going to be able to provide leadership. It's not a matter of only working up the epistemology, that is, how do you translate knowledge and research into policies, programs and projects? How do you do it? We don't understand too much about it.

In my paper, I have addressed myself to what I hope is your interest, namely, how do you organize the resources of your institution? Or how do you, as the national officer responsible for the work of an organization, how do you organize its endeavors so that you do bring it to focus on the problems of the American city - urban problems?

This final point I suggest to you: urbanization is a resource: I wouldn't call the city a natural resource - I call it a man-made resource. And if we understand how to utilize urbanization we can generate social and economic energy. The history of this country and the history of Western Europe demonstrate that where the history of some of the other parts of the world show that there has been this failure of a city. It's not so much a matter of constraining urbanization as it is of releasing the energy of urbanization. As I have studied the policies and, to some extent, the programs that were and weren't inspired by the policies, and often there wasn't, but there has been an effort to contain urbanization. We have had a policy of containment, of restraining urbanization instead of releasing energies.

The task for the next decade is to find the way to release the energy of urbanization, so this country can move on into its third century.

A.B. Biscoe:

Last night President Ahlberg remarked how difficult it was these days to assemble any group of people in the same manner as his dean at the Maxwell School used to do with the graduate students. As I look around this room I can't help but be impressed. Someone has done a remarkable job of assembling this group of people this morning. I congratulate you, Clark, and Larry and Bill and Fred and the others who were responsible for it.

I think that the chances of saying anything new on this subject in the course of five minutes and saying it to this audience are rather remote. In a bicentennial year it would be appropriate to say, by way of beginning, that we hold these truths to be self evident for us all, that capabilities do exist in colleges and universities that can help solve urban and local government problems.

And, secondly, that needs exist in our state and local governments, including county, as well as municipal governments. The task is how do we relate the two more effectively than perhaps we have in the past. I hope that the paper I wrote did not appear to be negative. My particular trench or foxhole happens to be Tennessee. My particular battle underway is how we bring our university resources in the form of technical assistance to local governments in Tennessee, by way of fulltime professional public service staff, and the faculty resources and the student resources, on the five campuses of the university system.

It's not inappropriate to refer to this as the battle, because we find at the local level that there are so many players in the game, so many self-interests represented. The challenge is really the challenge of harnessing these self interests in a way that brings together those with the capability to serve local government and those in local governments with the need for services in some productive way.

The thrust of my paper, essentially, was intended to be encouragement to approach this task on an extremely realistic basis. To take the time to define what we are talking about, what the capabilities of the resources are, what the needs of the client groups are, and to discuss as much as we need to discuss. What kinds of goals we are, realistically, though, trying to set for academic institutions in this endeavor? Having done this, we need to find a way to communicate effectively not only among ourselves in Washington, but all the way down through the structures that we all represent and are part of to the local level where service actually occurs.

The most telling sentence written in any of the five background papers was a product of John Osman's pen, and it's a very simple sentence, it says: "There are no tricks in providing public service."

What we need to do is to realize that we have a very challenging task before us in terms of defining what we talked about, are talking about, communicating it up and down and across in a way we can understand the point at which we can build some commitment.

The commitments that need to be built, in my opinion, are those that have faculty members talking productively to and with local government representatives and where we have local government representatives committed to and looking toward their academic institutions as potential resources in helping solve urban and rural problems.

James Caplinger:

The paper I wrote is based upon four major assumptions. First, the typical city in the U.S. today needs expert opinion. Not just the city, but the county or whatever local governmental unit we happen to be talking about in a particular case. It is ridiculous to expect the sum total of that expert advice to be available on the staff of any administration in this country. There is not continuing need for the full range of expertise that would justify having these experts fulltime on the typical city staff.

It's also based on the assumption that the expertise that is needed goes far beyond what is available on the faculty of schools of public administration. Over the years there has been the development of a good liaison between the practitioner and the academic. Today the advice a city needs ranges through the physical sciences, the social sciences, the professions, and the full range of academia.

This creates a problem, because in the matter we are considering today we are really not talking about just creating a liaison between the practitioner and the academic.

When we look at the full range of professional backgrounds represented in academe which has relevance for the cities we're talking about, the ramifications are huge in trying to bring about this kind of cooperative venture.

It is worthwhile, because, frequently, the taxpayer is supporting both the people on the city staff and those who are at the university and it seems efficient for society as a whole, to try to bring these two together rather than duplicate expertise on the city staff.

The second assumption which I have made in my paper is that institutionalization of cooperative efforts is required because so often in the past the cooperative venture has failed because it depended upon the continuing relationship between two or more individuals, one in the city and one in the university. If one dies, leaves or whatever happens then the venture is in jeopardy.

The third assumption that I make is that there must be greater familiarity between the academic and the practitioner encouraged. So often they have little in common. Now that's not true of the public administration professor and the practitioner, but it is true when we get to the physical sciences, and the other social sciences by and large. We who are practitioners and those who are academics, attend different meetings, write for and read different journals. We do not cross paths very often. And I believe some mechanism for bringing us together in a setting such as this, but letting it pervade throughout city halls in the country and the various universities is really required.

The fourth assumption that I make in the paper is that a team approach is required. We have in the city management profession people who have been rather highly educated; yet so often they feel that they are being treated as a junior partner when the cooperative venture is undertaken on a specific research assignment. Feeling that, the academic is portraying himself as an expert and is downgrading the ability of the local government practitioner. Obviously, the academic should be billed as an expert because we are asking him to provide expert services. But my approach is that we need to develop a cooperative venture that works more in the fashion of a team approach so that we have the two partners together designing the research project and shaping the utilization that will be made from it, without either being treated as a junior partner.

In the paper I discussed a particular model that we had utilized in Kalamazoo, or tried to utilize. It never really got implemented. We felt in Kalamazoo and we were dealing with Western Michigan University at that point, that there ought to be a separate center that would have as its thrust the development of such a cooperative venture. The center was to be approved both by the Board of Trustees at the University and the City Commission. The administrative officials of the Center were to report directly to the President of the University and to the City Manager and then of course through them to the Board of Trustees and to the City Commission. The relatively low budget for the Center which was to be supported equally by the university and the city. And the entire model was developed on a basis of equality throughout.

The Center was to be governed by a Policy Council composed of eight people, four appointed by the University and four by the City. It was the job of this Policy Council to determine what kinds of research projects could be undertaken that would be beneficial to both. A part of their determination was to identify the appropriate people in City Hall along with the appropriate people in the University who would work as a team on any given research project. They were then to determine who bore the cost of the research. Was there a grant available for it? Did it benefit only the city, in which case the city ought to pay the full bill for that entire project. Or did it benefit the university only, in which case the university would pay the entire cost and there would be no cost to the city.

The Center was to be directed by a half-time person. There was to be an associate director who also would be half-time. One of these would come from the city and the other from the University and then they would alternate every time a term expired. The Director would then go to the other organizations so that there was total equality throughout the ongoing potential history of the Center.

The Center was to create a library or a depository for materials so that these could be collected in one central point making them useful over a period of time. One important function of the Center was to publicize, throughout the two organizations its existence and its capability of designing research projects and attempting to bring people who had problems into the Center looking for a way of reaching a potential answer.

This model was designed to serve one university and one city but we saw it as being capable of expansion so that at a later point other governmental units and other colleges and universities in the metropolitan area could be brought in. We felt that we ought to start with something manageable and bring together just one university and one city. And that proved not to be too manageable since the project never did get implemented. However, it is a model that deserves to be looked at as we start talking about cooperative ventures.

There is a great temptation when we talk about cooperative ventures to comment on the fact that we really need to look at the national level and create a national policy for cooperation between the university and the city. My paper is based upon the feeling that we really need to begin at the local level creating cooperative ventures between the local city and the local university and then let something that is more national in scope evolve from that point.

Glenn Fisher:

My paper is based on experiences at at least three universities, including Wichita State University. About four years ago, I attended an Urban Observatory Conference in the Kansas City area. After we had talked about the obstacles to the Urban Observatory movement for a couple of days, I recall a city Councilman from Kansas City said 'You know, I've listened to your academic people talk and I really learned something about universities. I thought that we people in the city who wanted the university to do something could just call up the president and convince him and he would order some faculty member to do it. And now I realize that universities don't work that way'.

My paper does try to analyze this rather strange organization known as the university. Again, most of you are very acquainted with the things I discuss. The American university is primarily organized around departments, which in turn are oriented toward national disciplines. These disciplines have their own journals, their own organizations, their own system of rewards, their prestige systems. Young faculty members who come out of the system find themselves oriented toward a particular kind of research, a particular kind of activity, that will lead them to prestige in the particular discipline.

This type of organization has worked extremely well in discovering new knowledge in the research enterprise. It's worked fairly well with regard to the way of organizing of teaching particularly in the traditional liberal arts subjects. However, the organization has some weaknesses when we address ourselves to the academic public service including the training of people in professional administration and related jobs.

Universities have imposed a second kind of structure to deal with this and these are noted in the professional schools, schools of business, schools of architecture, etc. in which you draw together people from several disciplines and try to orient them toward a particular enterprise which does not necessarily follow disciplinary lines. Part of the success of this depends upon creating national organizations, national journals, national placement networks, so that a young faculty member can devote himself to a particular professional interest, or a particular service area interest, and hope to get some prestige or reward to keep his mobility so that he can move to other universities.

The most successful example of this, of course, is found in the land-grant universities. All my career until I went to Wichita has been spent in land-grant universities. One very small and one very large. They have oriented a large part of the university toward serving the farm and agricultural interest. They have departments, traditional departments which have names like Agriculture stuck in front of them. Agricultural Economics, Agricultural Sociology. They have a vast network of organizations, research coordinating groups, they have a system of recording research contribution so that experiment station bulletins and so forth are recorded. Faculty members can earn what we refer to as brownie points by this sort of thing. Now, if there's anything new in my paper, it may be that I was trying to challenge here a little bit the traditional analysis of why this system hasn't worked with urban problems as it has with rural problems.

We usually say that the agricultural schools are concerned with technical physical problems which are easier to get hold of, easier to solve. And at least we know when we solve them as compared with the more complex political urban problems.

There's another interpretation that may be more useful. The Agriculture schools have oriented themselves toward a particular client group. Now they're lucky because it turns out that farmers are geographically segregated. And we elect state prepresentatives, state legislators and congressmen from geographic areas. So that in serving the agricultural interests the land-grant college can develop a very powerful political position. They've got a lot of happy people as they serve these groups. Now when the urban schools serve the various interest groups, the businessman, the labor unions, the architects, whatever, it is a diverse interest and the political ramifications are not always particularly good.

If this analysis is correct, it does seem to me that a possible strategy for urban institutions might be to say we're going to establish a clientele relationship, a service relationship with that group which best represents urban needs and urban interests. That group has to be local governments.

We could get into a lot of philosophical and political science problems about whether local government really represents the urban area and which local government are we going to talk about. Those are things we could deal with.

A strategy that we might work on is to look toward this kind of an alliance. Can we develop ways of helping each other, universities and local governments? Al Biscoe had a paragraph on commitment. It seems to me the problems that we need to deal with today includes: are we willing to commit ourselves to really work at this and are we willing to create the structures, the organizations, that will help us deal with it?

James Williams:

I'm trying to give a point of view of one city manager and one area of the country. There are two things that I really want to discuss with you this morning. One is some of the problems that I think we, and this project will run into. What are some of the barriers that you'll run into when you come into a city hall?

I'm assuming that, if this goes on, there are suspicions and differences in orientation which I think will cause some real problems or some barriers that we'll be confronted with. One of these is, of course, the general suspicion that the politician has toward the academic community. There's a tendency of university graduates and students to raise embarrassing political questions. While that would seem to be the goal of a democratic society, it does not lead to re-election in most instances so people resist this kind of discussion. There are times when they just don't want to discuss major policy issues in the community.

Secondly, there's a difference in time orientation that we have that the university community may not have. And I'll discuss it from the other side too in just a moment. Generally, we're looking toward the next budget, the next election, and rather short-term goals. They may not extend much more than a year or two at most.

Thirdly, educational institutions tend to have a theoretical orientation which is totally appropriate but sometimes beyond our ability to comprehend.

Finally, in my experience working with University systems there may tend to be a difference in terms of study period. In other words, sometimes the students who are working with this or the faculty teams that are working with us will want to complete a project within one term of study or within a semester. Now this seems to be the opposite of the problem I was raising before on the next election or the next budget. But we do find that these periods of orientation can do different because they may want to complete their project for a degree or a credit or something like that. They may or may not fit our problem in that community.

Given those circumstances and some of those problems I would urge this: whatever we do, whatever direction we proceed, first establish a demand. The key to the success of this kind of project is determining what that demand may or may not be.

There are various kinds of survey techniques you may use. Rather than go out and present a program and say "Here we are. We're here to help," first find out what city hall or the county administrators need before you proceed in that direction.

There are a lot of techniques presently available. I've suggested some of them in the paper. Among the most successful that I've dealt with is the UCLA MBA program. Strangely enough, the greatest amount of assistance we've received has been through the Graduate School of Business at UCLA. They established a group of students with faculty advisors from various disciplines, economics, political science, etc., depending on the city problem. That team is placed in the city for a semester or two semesters if necessary. The student gets credit for work done. It's been a very workable, useful program at least from our standpoint and that of a couple of other cities.

Finally, there has to be some reward system established for the people from the university to make this project worthwhile. That would be my other key point. We've been involved this summer with a group of California educators in public administration. They indicated to me they would like very much to spend a year or maybe a semester working in a city fulltime. 'Our university or college does not have any reward system for us to do this.' If we get into this that there must be some reward system, so it is possible for those of you in the academic community to receive that reward when you're working in a city. I do believe it's of greatest benefit when this kind of arrangement is made.

General Discussion

Judah Drob:

It's important to emphasize a few things that are not absent from the papers but which I think we forgot to underline. The first is user orientation. What Jim Williams just said about an academic reward system underlines that thought. In a program that deals with academic peoples it turns out to be a basic problem of their motivations as they try to deal with a program activity. User orientation is a critical thing that we have to bear in mind in this kind of enterprise.

Along with that we understand you to mean there is often some sort of a hidden agenda on the part of the people who put the programs together. I'm talking about the academics hidden agenda.

But in the sense that we're trying to get something that is useful for a program or policy, there is an academic person who is trying to meet the demands of the reward system in which he functions. Those are frequently at odds with each other. For example, we thought, as one of the speakers did, the emphasis of the agricultural colleges on the needs of the farmer is a good example of excellent user orientation. Another point that needs to be made is that policy frequently is determined idologically. It is not determined by research and fact but by the ideology of the elected officials. This is a very critical and difficult problem that has to be faced.

Research by itself can hardly be enough. We have to think of both research and development. Development is a very critical element, sometimes preceding research.

Another way of saying user orientation is to use a couple of words like reciprocity, or respect, or respect for the user, respect for knowledge, respect for the fact there are a lot of solution answers out in the field. The academic people are not necessarily depositories of all user knowledge.

Bernard Hillebrand:

My observation is that the academicians rarely get to use it. For example, there are conferences of people who manufacture and distribute ice cream, but people who make machines to do that never bother to go to the conventions. We've been running meetings now for 20 years and rarely have academicians come. It's this question about rewards. If you don't pay them, they don't come. I'm not talking just about travel, you also have to pay them salaries.

We've been experimenting with different kinds of approaches. Our experience is that people on the firing line learn from each other, not from professors. They get together and swap ideas. Our meetings are the most profitable to identify problems and also to suggest some solutions. We have been trying again to adapt some of the techniques of the agricultural people and apply them. We have a Lilly Foundation grant, for example, in four states to send people out in the field and be a contact between the people in the field with the problem and the resources which are in some cases at a University, in some cases at a Federal agency.

We have had great success with IPA. We've done it in four states, moving on to four other states. The success of that is the fact that our state associations are now paying cost out of their money after the initial grant.

One of the comments made in Jim Caplinger's paper is that technical assistance is not available in a community. That's true, but it is available in some communities. The people who know the most about running hospitals are

are employed by a county somewhere in the U.S. The people who know the most about team nursing are already employed by the public.

We've been experimenting with something called self-help. We identify these experts and try to make them available in-house so to speak, moving around, doing conferences or a show-and-tell sort of thing. We found this a rich sources of help. But just as a generalization, the university per se is not considered an important resource.

One final development in the state of Mississippi, where they utilize a land-grant college. We've got a number of young people associated with the university now and also under the direction of our State Association of Counties out in the field, visiting communities. It's something like the agricultural extension agency. So far it's working very well.

Eugene Weldon:

In response to Judah's comment, the Agricultural Extension Service did not begin as a user orientation. It's something with 60 odd years of existence. It started with a definite objective in mind. It grew into a user organization.

One additional comment: Bernie, true, we do learn from each other, but what I witness all too frequently in meetings of public officials or public employees is the pooling of ignorance rather than discuss and hearing ideas.

Bernard Hillebrand:

You have an advantage, we've never attended your meetings.

Guthrie Birkhead:

What I have to say may come out as though it were a defense of professors, though I don't intend it that way, although they do need a little defending.

It's my experience and that of the Urban Affairs section in NASPAA that there are a lot of success stories about the university role in government and university - community relations - around the country. I'm not sure that those ongoing successes will be particularly helpful for national organizational effort to improve relations at the level we're talking about. I'm pretty sure, however, that a national effort to publicize and strengthen those efforts will give great assistance to localities and universities that aren't doing things very well now.

Bernie Hillebrand knows very well that there are success stories around the country. In fact, he's participated in one of those. The fact is that if university-community relations are going to develop over the long term, it doesn't make much difference whether the professors come there (to conventions) or not as far as individual cities and universities are concerned.

Bernard Hillebrand:

But the model is the University of North Carolina, and it's your point that it didn't start out to be what it now is. It's now a University for public officials in North Carolina. They don't consider it to be part of the university system. They consider it their university. They teach you any damn thing in the world from basket weaving to how to make a tax bill. It is part and parcel of that community. But it is so oriented to the users that it is their university.

The agricultural people bend that mechanism to suit their own purposes. I think that is the model and we have held conventions at the Institute at Chapel Hill, and have tried to get some of the other universities to move in that same direction. They'll teach you anything there. It's truly a marvelous institution.

The University of Wisconsin is the same kind of thing. The entire community are responding to the users. It's just a dichotomy that the users are not with the university resources.

Samuel Magill:

We're (Association of American Colleges) primarily an organization attending to the undergraduate liberal arts colleges and colleges of arts and sciences. So, speaking from the academic side, and with some trepidation, I'd like to respond to Dr. Osman's paper which I think gets to the root of the problem from the academic side; that is, your discussion of the need for a paradigm, both from the perspective of training officials and from the perspective of citizens' education. That is a tunnel vision induction approach within the university and undergraduate colleges, and so undermines our ability to perceive the problems as wholes, and citizens, as well as officials, come to complex problems unable to integrate and approach them in a systematic fashion.

It would be my guess that the primary and most impelling objective within the higher education establishment would be to work out the problems of changing perspective, attitudes, and paradigmatic understandings by faculty, hoping to pass that on to coming generations of students.

That's an enormous, perhaps, an impossible task in the short term, but over a 60-year period maybe this is the kind of thing that we could come to. It seems to me this is a very urgent priority, not just for urban studies but for issues of all kinds, global as well as regional.

Bernard Hillebrand:

I'm suggesting you move to a division of labor. Our county officials will go to the school and teach the courses that are presently being taught on how miserable county government is and the professors can come into our communities and help us do the job better.

This constant harping, quoting at each other from books that were written half a century ago about how miserable county government is, is antagonistic. It's very difficult for us to respond to those kind of things. It would be damned helpful if the academic community would go out to our meetings, out to our communities, and see how miserably we're doing everything. It would at least acquaint them with what our problems are. They might be stunned to find out we're really doing generally a darn good job in a hell of a lot of places, particularly in the urban counties.

George Frederickson:

I wonder if the authors of the papers consciously chose to narrow their concerns for academic public service to a general field of public administration. It seems to me that Frederick Mosher and Jack Tunney and other authors said eloquently that the administration is a small part of public service. And while we joked about universities being made up of departments with some kind of autonomy, any of us who have worked with government understand that governments also are made up of departments. As an example, I submit to you the whole world of social work out there. Our universities produce those social workers. There's no one here to represent that whole range of public service.

You can say the same thing about public works, recreation, and parks administration. Increasingly, law enforcement and public safety officials are products of that part of the university. I would not be surprised if 10 or 15 years from now the university is almost an exact mirror of local government and that most every new law enforcement official will be the product of a law enforcement program at a university. To focus that attention here primarily on public administration seems to me to be not even the tip of the iceberg; we may have missed the iceberg altogether.

James Williams:

In my comments, I was not restricting them to the management level - city managers or county administrators. What I foresee would be specific project assistance in our instance and other cities instances. We've been involved in just the kind of thing you're talking about: recreation, parks, public works, fire, police, and so on. In no way would I urge the restriction of whatever program may come out of this thing as just pure management administration. It doesn't really exist anyway.

George Frederickson:

Maybe that'll get us back to Bernie's point. If you want to focus on what the universities have traditionally done best, it is pre-career and, increasingly, mid-career education for professionals in discreet boxes of public service. We continue to do that, but then we organize on the side a whole bunch of state level things that are the equivalent of the Institute of Government at the University of North Carolina. Is that where the dialogue really leads us? If so, I find that very disappointing.

Glenn Fisher:

This is a good comment. Fred Sudermann and I discussed this earlier when we were chatting about this whole project. A great deal of the local government and university reaction and interaction needs to come, and does come, in technical areas—engineering or whatever. In terms of focusing the papers, I suspect that you can't handle everything in one paper. The sort of thing that I'm talking about, for instance, would encompass the technical people. But I suspect that public administration types are going to have to take the lead in this, they are the ones that are more organized.

Ann Macaluso:

There isn't very much emphasis at this meeting on state government. There's almost no emphasis at all on the legislative branch of government. If the traditional animosity that the public administration people feel for the state legislature continues, perhaps the best thing to do is turn to the narrow specialities and technical areas because state legislatures now have indicated that they will accept such assistance from a university. In fact, they're asking for it. It seems to me we miss a real bet without even meaning to by talking about the executive branch of government when the legislative is in real need of assistance, as everybody here knows.

James Caplinger:

I'm somewhat concerned at the general thrust our discussion has taken. We seem to have come full circle back to where we're basically talking about how the university can identify what the user wants and teach in those areas. That concerns me greatly, because we are stressing dissatisfaction with where we are at the present time.

I assume we've arrived at the point where we're saying we want a different kind of relationship between the practitioner and the university, and yet we're getting back into the traditional, accepted mold.

While I agree that the university has to tailor itself somewhat to what the professional wants, there has to be a willingness on the part of the practitioner to examine some new theories and new ideas and to assume the traditional practices may not be the only way.

The thrust of whatever is put together here and explored in the future should be seeking the middle ground.

In addition, I think we've talked far too much about teaching. In many cases, we're not looking for the teaching function in city hall or in the county court house. We're looking for some specific kind of actual research that provides a solution to the problems. It may not relate to the teaching at all.

In addition, I'm concerned about the way we are getting back into the separate disciplines. There's no way that we can deal with the urban problems of today by talking about only the public administration faculty. We've got to talk to sociologists, psychologists, and to members of a number of the disciplines. We need a mechanism to tie these various disciplines together. An access point which brings the profession into touch with some kind of a combined grouping that lets us start to get a handle on the problem.

I'm concerned that we direct ourselves that specifically toward asking a group of practitioners, and I consider myself to be a practitioner. They don't know totally what they want.

We need to be stretched by the innovative thinking that is done in the universities. But we don't want to go full circle and have to do it totally the university way. We need a kind of middle ground.

John Osman:

What we probably need to do here is recognize the tremendous areas that we simply can't explore in the time available to us. What we are interested in precisely is: have we now a situation in which most of our urban problems are national problems?

We all recognize the role of localities and states in this whole affair. I would suggest that we need to go further into the concerns that brought you together.

What are the possibilities for liaison between the public interest groups that are represented here and the associations of the various institutions of higher education that are represented here? Is there a way to work this out so that somehow the resources of the institutions of higher education can be utilized by the public interest groups, not only at the national level in Washington but all over the country?

Here in Washington we begin to look out over the country and we think everything is emanating from Washington. We would like to reverse the flow of policy in this country. We'd like for policy to come into Washington from the cities, counties and the states. But to get that done, perhaps it's going to have to be initiated here in Washington through the public interest groups such as you and through the universities.

Bernard Hillebrand:

If someone in the private sector gets a grant from the federal government and acquires an expertise on toenails or something which they're paid to do, they then go out and sell it to everybody else. They sell the idea they were paid for by the federal government and they become the expert.

There was a comment made that this has to be institutionalized. This business of serving the practitioner has to be institutionalized. I made the comment about the University of North Carolina because I think they have begun to institutionalize it there.

I would suggest that one of the things that we consider at this meeting is perhaps joint grants. Let me give you a specific example. In 1956 NACO and the League of Cities proposed an amendment to the Highway Acts for continuing comprehensive highway transportation planning. No university got involved in that. A firm was created by the handful of people that had some credentials and all the publics which wanted to know something about highway transportation had to hire this consulting firm. I'm not being critical. But why didn't we start making grants then? Why didn't we consider that the League of Cities and other organizations that got these grants build in a university component?

Why can't universities adjust their operations to become that kind of a resource? We've paid for it once already. We consider those universities, particularly the land grant ones, that are publicly supported, and most of them are now, to be as much a part of the public as we are. Yet we lose this opportunity and even when it goes to the university, someone will acquire an expertise and then leave the university to become a consultant.

How many discussions have we had individually with colleges and universities about building the bridge between the people who've got the problem and people who should have the resource? We've tried in various areas such as computer technology.

Again, it does get back to technology, not the policies. You're not going to get any group of city or county officials or state legislators excited about urban transportation planning. But if you talk about planning a subway system or how to get more out of highway dollars, the problems at the firing line come up very, very precisely.

John Osman:

Bernie, I think you have stated the problem very well. We will close this session now and, after the break, Graham Watt takes up where we left it.

Clark Ahlberg introduced Graham Watt, President of the National Training and Development Service, saying he had had a long and distinguished career as city manager, as the first Director of Federal Revenue Sharing, and an active role in planning the program.

Graham Watt:

Some of you know that for many years my background was as a city manager; and the general image of a city manager is a coat and tie type, fairly neat and proper. In my present role, however, at National Training and Development Service, we're more a shirtsleeves type of operation. But I want you to know that I have not forgotten the six years I spent in the federal service under two different administrations.

Permit me one opening observation. In recent years we have seen academicians and practitioners alike, come increasingly to the view that knowledge is not a sort of a commodity to be stored in the university, and to be parceled out in some fashion among the students by those who are distinguished at the university. Rather we recognize increasingly that knowledge, or the acquisition of knowledge, grows from the synthesis of history and tradition and theory and understanding of personal and social behavior. The synthesis of that is the practical learning of field experience. If you will - the synthesis of pedagogy and androgyny. It's the kind of synthesis that, in the words of Herbert Simon, only really satisfactorily takes place within the intricate mechanism of the individual human brain.

I suggest the interaction and the cooperation between the public sector and the academic communities is seen in a great variety of ways: curriculum development and review internship-type programs, the urban observatory programs and joint projects of various kinds.

Our interest here in increased academic public service is timely. Mark Keane made reference to this last night in his comments following dinner. And it may be that timeliness is the essential ingredient which was missing before. The purpose of this workshop is to help to determine possibilities for cooperative arrangements and action programs designed to improve higher education's responses to the problems faced by local and state governments. And further, for the purposes of this workshop, a consensus has been assumed that some continued mechanism that would encourage additional cooperative endeavors between public interest associations and higher education associations is desirable. And I suggest we should begin the discussion by testing that assumption.

Is it one which does in fact represent a consensus for this group? The first item on the agenda is a restatement of the assumption that an interactive relationship would be mutually beneficial. Is there anyone who wishes to challenge that assumption? Or to question it? Or to suggest that it needs to be modified? The consensus has been assumed that some continued mechanism that would encourage additional cooperative endeavor between the public interest group and the higher education association is desirable. It was suggested that we add the federal government as a participant in the cooperative endeavor. (Participants agreed.)

Joseph Mullen:

What are the practical information exchanges or relationships which are envisioned by the development of this relationship? In my organization, we have quite a few success stories with individual legislatures interrelating with universities. These largely are encouraged by my organization, but a lot are independent of my organization. What are the types of activities which my organization would get into as a result of our activity here?

Graham Watt:

The first item to follow this little piece of the agenda, the first issue to be discussed here is what programs should we consider? And may we just hold your point for a moment and see if we're all on the same point of agreement? Is there anyone who challenges the assumption? It is a concept at this point, but I think it's key to our proceeding together.

First issue is what programs ought to be considered as we think about a future interactive relationship?

The second issue is what mechanisms are needed? We'll look at structure, organization, relationships.

And finally, what action can we take and how? What future agenda can we agree upon before we leave this meeting which will carry us forward and into some stance of progress and improvement. So let's look then at that first issue: what programs to consider. We should come forth with suggestions or questions framed in terms of a mutually interactive relationship which is going to work presumably at a national level and at a local level and which joins together the public sector and higher education sector. What kinds of programs and activities would be appropriate and timely? What do we put on the agenda? Where do we start?

Thomas Bruderle:

Graham, I would make a suggestion and reverse that. I would suggest what we need before determining what we want to do is determine what we are and who we are.

Very often our contacts have been between two or more people who in time are no longer going to be available. The first action we should take is to come up with a mechanism in the form of institution. Once we have done that we then can decide what programs the creation might encompass.

Graham Watt:

The suggestion is that we reverse the order of the agenda and take up first the design of the organization. What is your thought about that?

James Williams:

I have to argue against that in the sense that it doesn't necessarily have to be institutional per se. It's much more important to talk about some ideas and programs that may or may not be done in a strict institution sense; but ideas to get things rolling.

Graham Watt:

I see some heads nodding. We'll look now at programs and activities. Feel free to start throwing some ideas out. We don't have to organize them, we don't have to justify them.

James Williams:

Clearly, it's my own vested interest, the idea of building a program. The program I'd like to bring up is the idea of interchange of individuals within the various camps which may exist out there. The idea of a faculty spending some time--not just showing up once in a while to survey the scene--in City Hall or federal agencies to get some work experience.

And the reverse side, of getting federal, state and local individuals in the university to be not just a figurehead, but to provide a curriculum in teaching; and a whole variety of other ways of moving people around between the public interest groups and their client group. There is one serious problem in Washington--Potomac Fever. You end up with staffs who have no idea what's going on out in Walla Walla, Washington.

A.B. Biscoe:

We should be much more aware of our success stories at meetings such as this. We sometimes fail to realize that there is an awful lot of good work going on.

The success stories can be not only in terms of universities, but cases where communities are happy with what they've had from universities and have been able to use them. This kind of thing will be a mainstay in helping generate commitment to the notion that we're trying to promote. It applies to failures as well. If we can learn from those failures, perhaps we can learn from those success stories.

Graham Watt:

Does your suggestion also carry with it a thought of some kind of transfer mechanism other than just telling a story; of being able to draw upon the actual experience and the personalities and the circumstances that underlay the successes?

A.B. Biscoe:

It does in time. In the short run, I'd have to say probably not, because of the resources required to establish effective transfer mechanisms both at the national level and within the user groups. In time, it seems to me that this would be a very worthwhile role.

Unidentified Speaker:

What's the sense of identifying success stories and failures if you don't disseminate them to the system?

A.B. Biscoe:

I'm not saying that they shouldn't be disseminated. I was responding to Graham's comment which I interpreted to mean should there be formal transfer mechanisms, something beyond the interpersonal transfer by using the telephone and the mail. A formal transfer mechanism should be established when we find out how. I really don't think we know how yet, nor do we have the resources to do it effectively: when you think in terms of what would be required for a given university to organize the resources, e.i., evaluate and send out the success stories in usable terms, and make them useful to their own setting. This is a tremendous undertaking, which I think is sometimes underestimated.

Ann Macaluso:

It seems to me that public interest groups have house organs and government agencies have transfer mechanisms that ought to be utilized for that purpose. Public Management might well devote an issue to that sort of thing sometime soon and disseminate it through its own system. It seems to me that we have to use existing mechanisms in this entire field. Universities are not the only actors in this field. Everybody wants in on this game. It's the hottest thing in the country.

A.B. Biscoe:

I agree completely with the use of mechanisms.

Joseph Juliannelle:

At Labor we've been studying or trying to find out about the feasibility of a national clearinghouse system and the process of delving into already established data bank systems. Frankly, there's very little expense involved in using an already available system. All you have to do is work on a mechanism for your output, in other words, some kind of a system of abstracts or key words or whatever. An informational clearinghouse ought to be one of the issues.

James Caplinger:

In looking at the national level it might be productive to consider the development of models for cooperative ventures that would go beyond or not be included in the success stories.

Scotty Campbell:

To begin with, the difficulty of talking about this on such a general and abstract level is that it involves certain assumptions which may not be true. Underlying these discussions is the assumption that there is a lot of knowledge out there in universities and, perhaps, elsewhere, which is unused. If we only had it we could then solve problems. I suggest to you that's not true. We don't know how to solve rising crime rates. We don't know how to deal with the deteriorating economic base of central cities. There's a whole set of things that nobody knows.

To believe that bringing the universities closer to the practitioners will solve those problems inevitably results in frustration and failures. Often those are the failures that we point to.

On the other hand, if you take the body of accepted wisdom or knowledge, on the whole, the relationships between universities and practitioners which do exist now are able to use that knowledge well.

There are a lot of mechanisms for it. Last night Mark Keane mentioned the "green book" of the ICMA which has summaries of what we know about something at this point in time. They're widely used by practitioners and in academic institutions. There are all kinds of mid-career programs and continuing education programs which do this.

If we turn to that second set of problems for which we do not have answers, it's important here there be a mutual relationship between practitioners and academics, investigating and trying to find, first of all causation, then solutions. Within that context, it's wrong to assume there is a one-way user relationship as was suggested earlier. The user relationship runs both ways, and it ought to be seen as running both ways.

If we can develop mutual research enterprises which attempt to get at the cutting edge of problems, then we can make a contribution. Here is a place where national associations can play the role because they can help jointly with academics to define some of these problems. They can find some kinds of laboratories out there within which that kind of work can go on. Perhaps in that process we really can add to our body of knowledge. For many of us, that's a really exciting thing. It does require a two-way street in which neither side if the user and the other side is the supplier, but are both.

James Williams:

In Tacoma, the local university actually established a small campus organization within the city structure with faculty. They benefitted from the standpoint of getting really first-rate training for their students and the city benefitted from the standpoint of getting students for research people and as research resources.

Guthrie Birkhead:

May I add to Scotty's point? There really are no magic answers waiting to be used, lying there in the university on substantive problems. The point I wish to make is that there really are no magic answers institutionally, to these problems either. It would be a fallacy for us to assume that a small number of models would suffice to educate universities and communities in how this is done. Underlying any set of arrangements is a climate of mutual trust and cooperation that has to precede any kind of institutionalization. The trouble with models is that they limit the range of thinking that's possible here. What's really necessary is a lot of innovation as to the way to institutionalize. To try to siphon all of the university's resources through one office, for example, may work in a small number of cases but not in all.

Graham Watt:

You're suggesting then that perhaps we've not found yet the best groups or the best models for how to go about this.

Guthrie Birkhead:

What I'm suggesting is that it's a good idea to talk about models, but not to limit our thinking in so doing.

Andrew Boesel:

I'd like to follow up on Scotty's comment that mutual trust is needed. It strikes me that somehow there isn't ever mutual risk-taking. When it doesn't work the university has a tendency to fade into the woodwork and the city government or the state government is left holding the bag.

Graham Watt:

Not necessarily by choice, I assume.

Andrew Boesel:

Right. There does need to be a sense of mutuality in both the successes and the failures. And that doesn't seem to be.

Graham Watt:

Scotty, I would like just as a personal note to endorse your view because, as you say, when we refer to the crime problem we haven't defined the problem. There is no such thing, in my view, as the crime problem. That's the sum total of a whole lot of other things that we aren't really prepared to deal with. But it's not a lot of fun to get down there and grub with such matters as drug addiction and juvenile control and the court systems.

What about some other kinds of programs or activities that we ought to throw before this organization?

Earl Lindveit:

What new need has been established that did not exist over the past five or ten years which higher education could not selectively recognize? What is there now that we assume will stimulate educational institutions to somehow join together and come to grips with the urban problems?

James Williams:

I perceive from some of the schools around us that they are having real problems in getting money for various things they need to do. In a very practical sense, Dr. Fisher's paper raised the fact that if you have a constituency supporting you in certain projects you can get that money from the state legislature and other sources. In very practical terms that is what has happened in some instances in my own experience. That's rather limited but I see that as occurring. At the same time it answers a problem for me because I don't have sufficient research sources for people who can provide the kind of expert information that I need. I simply can't afford it at times. So I think that the thing really could be mutual.

George Maharay:

It's a very important dynamic that has been more pronounced in the past ten years: the decided shift in the nature of staffing. That is, the increasing state and local phenomenon where we're having gross problems in capability. When we talk about capacity building that's really where we're having our serious problems. We see the flattening out in size of the civilian part of the federal staffs, and the dynamic growth at the state and local level. That's one of the things that we're really having difficulty gripping in schools of public affairs. Other kinds of schools and colleges that prepare people for other parts of public service are experiencing the exact same thing. That's one dynamic, and if we had time, we could go into lots of others. I think that's one of the important ones. We are in a kind of new world, and I think we're trying to figure it out at the same time we are trying to meet it.

Ann Macaluso:

There may be a very strong threat to the democratic federal system of government in this country. There is a question of credibility in government. That probably is the singular new thing on the horizon that has shown up so much in the past two or three years. It says to the nation, as a whole, and to the leading institutions in the nation, we have to build this sense of community to support a system that has been valued for 200 years. It's not beyond the realm of possibility that the single event which makes this most timely and makes it most possible to think we can do it is the Bicentennial year. We ought to recognize some of this feeling. The need for community in this country is very strong.

Graham Watt:

Let me pose a question to try to stretch your sights and ask whether you would envision this kind of a program helping to identify or to specify a national need to which the public sector in the educational community would have responses in these areas? Is that something which is within the realm of your thinking?

John Simmons:

I've been a student of the federal system for the past four years and have been involved partially in the research and demonstration at HUD. There is absolutely no system at all. It's time for developing priorities and determining needs as to the dollars that are really meeting these needs and the resources that we have. I think, for example, of what we have to go through each year on our own little inplay in developing our research and demonstration budget and what must be happening all over the federal system. It would seem to me that there must be some mechanism that we could aim at in developing a much better system, in allocating these resources for urban research and demonstrations than we have.

Graham Watt:

Would you say then some joint undertaking could assist or influence that allocation process?

John Simmons:

There has to be more influence and power to be able to do this with the federal agencies.

Graham Watt:

Ann, do you have influence and power?

Ann Macaluso:

I wish everybody around this table would just agree to go ahead and force the federal government to respond. It's the single biggest need that we have. Much of the problem with what we're talking about rests right here in the city, that's what I was trying to say much more deliberately a few moments ago. If John is talking about resource allocations per se, its a whole lot more than that. One of the big questions that came up in a meeting we had yesterday was the need just for management.

If what we're talking about is management, whether its a program management or policy management or resource management, there is nobody pressing the federal government to say 'get your own house in order'. If the groups of institutions around this table were to agree to do that with their clientele and with their members, there would be an enormous pressure to have such a thing brought about.

Certainly that is going to happen. It must happen at the same time in the states, and I re-emphasize the states and all branches of government (executive, legislative and judicial) in this country.

Joseph Mullin:

I'm very much in favor of making the federal government more responsive. I'm also very, very much in favor of a cooperative endeavor in which we in the public interest groups are assisted by the institutions of higher learning in this country. But making the federal government responsive, as I read it, is called lobbying. I don't have any problem lobbying because my organization lobbies, but we have to make sure that that's what we intend to do when we develop our relationship.

Thad Beyle:

One of the problems with academic research and publications has been the federal government. Too many minds are taken off to Washington and spend time focusing on what goes on in Raleigh or their local governments. We've had a federalization of American government in the past 30 or 40 years. If you take a look at some of the textbooks and some of the monographs, and some of the publications or some of the journals you see that very, very clearly.

Seymour Berlin:

When we talk about program and the federal involvement, I'm almost not in agreement that the federal government should be part of a working group. I think that the danger that we could get into in the involvement of the government practitioner at all levels this closely is doing what we're doing but better. Somehow there's another program function and that is a charge agentry and a watchdog role, in which a group of the associations and the universities concern themselves with differing systems and approaches to problems that perhaps we can do better, but doing better isn't necessarily getting to some of the basic issues. What we find at the federal level, that I've seen, is that it is very difficult to find the locus of responsibility or interest in the mouthings of federalism. In other words, we need a little bit of capacity building. But yesterday, at the meeting that Ann mentioned, it clearly was evident to me that there was no desire on the part of officialdom in the federal government to take a leadership coordinating role of getting better management, or getting program or resource policy management. Now the issue is, do the universities as a group have fundamental program responsibility to review that and to make known publicly at all levels of government that this kind of leadership is necessary to meet some of the problems today; that the role of a university is looking at problems and perhaps overcoming some of the constraints that the public jurisdictions have. In that area, I see the university playing a very strong role in terms of looking at some of the problems in a little different area and forcing governments to take leadership in this area.

Earl Lindveit:

Higher education did not seem to take an effective stand in the urban affairs area. There are a number of success stories involving universities individually, some of which have been represented here. We are funding probably many innovative programs involving universities and local governments and many other agencies. The focus ought to be directed toward the local level, providing tools and case studies to solve local problems.

Larry Williams:

Your comments reminded me very much of something that National League of Cities tried to do several years ago, very unsuccessfully, in its creation of the National Urban Forum. The plan we had proposed and did not implement involved academic institutions as well as representatives from the private sector. It would have functioned as a body to recommend to the federal government policy positions in the urban area. If this is what you were suggesting, I think that potentially it has a great deal of merit.

Graham Watt:

Let's consider now what mechanisms are needed in order to foster, support and sustain this interactive relationship.

A. B. Biscoe:

I don't have a direct response to that, but I just want to observe that it seems to me that one of the common threads underlying almost all that was said by others is that a high priority ought to be a means to continue to communicate and it should be done effectively among people who can make these kinds of decisions, who can give these kinds of thrusts to the organizations. If we fail to recognize that, we're unlikely to solve these problems in a week or a month or a year. The notion of a way to continue to communicate productively is essential to what we're talking about.

Graham Watt:

I suggest we add to that, as a qualification for those who would be communicating, the ability to make commitments.

Thad Beyle:

Money is obviously a driving force in bringing in the academics. Individual faculty scholars often act in their own role. The problem they face too often is the constraint on being able to move out of the discipline and into doing something for state and local government. We need to focus on the constraint and its removal so that a person can move out when the mayor calls upon them.

Scotty Campbell:

I'd just like to reinforce the point from the standpoint of the nitty-gritty that has to be done if this is going to work. Universities vary a lot. First of all, there's the public-private variation. Even within those categories there are differences.

One has to recognize that a faculty member is on a payroll of a university; the university is paying him a salary to do a job. There is a sort of an assumption on the part of those outside the university that this person has all kinds of time available. And that therefore he should be on call to come down to City Hall and help wherever they need a little help.

I will not dwell here on the question of how much time in fact a faculty member may or may not have available, but I will say that he thinks he's paid to work full-time with the university.

If you're going to use him for a purpose outside the university, some kind of arrangement has to be made so that it is financially possible. Speaking as a dean of a university, if a faculty member within my school is going to be used half-time someplace else, I want him off my budget for that half-time and on somebody else's budget for that half-time.

Either the university has to have the resources internally from university funds, or a special line in a state budget if it's a state university; the local government that is using the person has to be willing to pick that up.

Frankly, I think that's a much more serious problem than the reward and punishment thing we've talked about here.

Certainly for a young assistant professor, who's trying to get tenure, the question of getting some publishing done in the professional journals and so forth may cause him to be reluctant to take on a practical job. Beyond that, a number of faculty are interested in that kind of work. It is increasingly accepted by their colleagues as useful and appropriate. That doesn't solve the fundamental budget issue in relation to how you do it. That requires the creation of some kind of a local mechanism.

Graham Watt:

Scotty, let me raise this question before I move out. If we were to envision a joint undertaking in which a local government and a university were mutually engaged, would that same situation prevail?

Scotty Campbell:

I'm curious in the Kalamazoo model if there has to be a hard agreement about it. Agreements like that could be worked out. But it cannot be done on an ad hoc basis. There has to be an established way.

Otherwise, the alternative is the specific arrangement for a specific faculty member. Somehow the using agency reimburses the university or the faculty member makes his own deal. And in that sense he's not acting differently than a private consultant.

Graham Watt:

I apologize for becoming embroiled in the discussion, but I'm trying to see if there's a distinction to be made between a situation in which a faculty member goes out himself to help a community and a situation in which there is created some kind of an interactive relationship between the university and the community which involves a commitment on the part of both parties.

Scotty Campbell:

The latter situation can work, if it is clearly understood how you're going to deal with budget issue within the university. I would argue that one of the difficulties that has been experienced in many places is that the arrangement is made between the mayor, or the city manager, and the president of the university, and he is not able to produce. And the reason he's not able to produce is that he does not give orders to the faculty members about what to do. You can give orders if half the pay is over here and instead of this course load you teach half a course load and do this half. You can work out those arrangements, but it's a real world in the university just like it is in the world of government. You've got budgets, and you've got to meet bottom lines. And that has to be recognized by the people who are asking the university for help.

Judah Drob:

There is a model. Obviously the federal government can't carry all of this, but in the Manpower Institutional Grant setup, we fund 13 institutional arrangements in 13 different universities, to provide training to state and local and federal officials in manpower. This might be seen as a possible model.

I understand that Mike Moscow, seeing the set-up, went on to do what he did at HUD along similar lines. That might be worth closer look sometime in the future.

Joseph Juliannelle:

I haven't found too much reluctance by universities to go out and obtain contracts within specific project work. Judah mentions one model, but there are dozens of others. I cannot see why if we as a group identify certain issues or problems to be met on a joint basis that we also cannot come to an agreement mutually on this budget question, too. I don't think anyone's asking for free services from the universities, but definitely there ought to be a financial arrangement and there certainly ought to be room for services to be provided as a public service also by the universities. Those things can be identified and really shouldn't be an institutional financial issue at this point.

A.B. Biscoe:

I think it's a rare local government that can provide on its own funds to support a university contract to do research on a major issue.

John Simmons:

That's why the federal government should be involved rather than be omitted.

A.B. Biscoe:

That's right, John. That's why the public interest groups should be involved. They can help identify significant issues not for one locality, but for a number of localities where the benefits of the research are made available to a user group that can command the resources, either directly or indirectly.

Joseph Juliannelle:

National issues can be separated a little bit, rather than a unique local issue that has to be met. It was said earlier that many local urban problems are really part of the national problem, i.e., they're generic to most cities. In a sense,while they're localized, local problems really are a national issue.

Certainly I don't count it as lobbying either if a group such as this demands from the federal government for a number of agencies to work together to help meet those problems.

Roger Yarrington:

The community colleges in our association have had such a focus for many years. A college within a community is supported by the community. The Board is of the community and so are the students.

The thing that we see happening in our communities is that new mechanisms are being created very fast to respond to these kinds of problems that we're talking about right now. In a number of the large cities, where there are a lot of community colleges, a device that is beginning to appear is a new administrative unit within the college. This has been done in Kansas City, in San Diego. A number of the colleges in those cities are districts and within the district are a number of colleges. In Kansas City, for example, there are three colleges and they have created a fourth one which has no geographical area. Its function is to do just what we've described here: to be responsible to needs identified in the community. It has as little shape and form as possible so that it can be as flexible as possible and it draws on the faculty and resources of the other three colleges, but it in itself is a separate college.

The community colleges in Jamestown, N.Y., have a similar idea that is slightly different. They have an administrative unit called an adhocracy to draw on the bureaucracy of the college. It is to be in itself completely flexible and able to respond. The kind of thing we're talking about and its national level set up could encourage and provide examples, guidelines, and case illustrations to both academic institutions and to city governments.

It's how matters can be arranged to accommodate needs; to be a responsive service. These problems do exist but I think there are lots of examples around the country of how they're being overcome. What we want to create, it seems to me, is a frame of mind, a lifestyle that says these things are good, here's a way to do them. Those of you who do them are going to find it very interesting, exciting, productive, and mutually beneficial. But it's not necessary to indicate in every locality how this can be done, but rather to create a frame of mind and indicate some of the modes of action flowing out of that frame of mind.

Graham Watt:

In the Kansas City situation how is that 4th college funded? Who pays for that?

Roger Yarrington:

The taxpayers.

Scotty Campbell:

In relation to a prior comment, governments do not expect free services from universities. That's not my experience. My experience is that they continuously are demanding free services, particularly state and local governments. Often, one of the reasons for the hard feelings between academic institutions and governments is that the universities do not respond because they can't respond within the context of their own resources. It is a real issue in the real world.

Larry Rutter:

The question, it seems to me, is begged by the fact that Bernie Hillebrand sits there and says "you guys don't come to our conferences; you don't do anything for us." But the fact is that we readily admit that many institutions badly need greater support. Why don't you ask "what do you guys in state and local government want?"

Graham Watt:

We do all the time.

Larry Rutter:

Why don't you ask it here? What are the problems you want us to solve? What are you willing to pay for us?

Scotty Campbell:

That's a very fair point. Earlier in the discussion, in the first session, I was somewhat unhappy that we weren't talking concrete issues. This point is well taken. I was trying to get at that by saying there's a set traditional things, such as training and supervision that go on a lot.

Then there are these cutting edge problems, which it seems to me are different and require a different kind of approach. I accept your point completely. It does need to be concrete. What is it that the governmental institutions think the universities have that they could effectively use? It's not an easily answered question. Whenever I push city manager-types, they say we aren't giving the kind of training that young people should have for the public service. When I ask "what do you want us to teach them?", the normal answer I get back is reading, writing,and arithmetic . That may be right, but it doesn't open up a whole new frontier in education.

James Caplinger:

I just want to point out that I think there is some validity to the feeling that governments are expecting much free service from universities. On the other hand, I think we need to bear in mind, that the university and the college does things in reverse to a great extent. Anybody's who's been a city manager knows how he can be inundated by the students coming out of the student placements. If you're not paying for them, you're not really getting anything of value to the government.

As we look at the question of who's going to pay for what, it's not a question we can easily resolve in the abstract. But we need to look at the specific piece of work, in a given situation to determine who benefits from what. Should the university pay for that, should the city, should neither, should both, or should we obtain a federal grant? I am a little bit concerned when we talk about the budget abstract without really placing a specific on what we are talking about.

A.B. Biscoe:

What I gathered from Scotty's initial comments is that you tend to consider kind of activity, including applied research, as something outside the normal course of university events which would have to be paid for in an identifiable budgetary way. If we as academic institutions define this role as something ancillary to the universities, then we have real honest-to-goodness problems ever generating an academic service role for state and local government.

In most major institutions a teaching load might be defined as 12 hours, but many faculty actually teach 6 to 9 hours and are expected to do scholarly research and institutional service for the remainder of that time without extra pay or impact on the departmental budget. I suggest this is a resource which, under certain circumstances, may well be applicable for the kinds of needs of state and local government we're talking about.

The key to this resource is really a matter of institutional commitment which comes down from president to academic vice president to dean to department heads. The key is saying, "if you were to choose applied research of relevance to state and local government and publish it, it would be recognized too as part of the institutional commitment upon which promotion and tenure and salary adjustments are based." This would come forth as a partial fulfillment of academes commitment to state and local government.

Scotty Campbell:

I'd like to respond to that, because it's important in relation to how the university works internally as it affects this external service role. Certain universities here differ one from another. You're quite right that the teaching load often officially is stated as being 12 hours when, in fact, it is less than that. The assumption is that the other time is the university support for your research. The faculty members, in most places, by tradition have come to see that as their time and, therefore, not to be assigned by the university administration for doing some purpose that is determined by them. That may vary from place to place.

It is certainly possible within the context of the university to take the local requirement and divide that between the classroom, other kinds of university services, plus certain kinds of community services which would include these things we're talking about.

Remember, at the university at a particular moment in time moves a larger portion of faculty members' time into this community service role. They are reducing the amount of time that faculty members have in the classroom, thereby reducing the resources available for what is considered the traditional function of the university and they've got to get more resources someplace.

A.B. Biscoe:

You're talking about a particular trade-off. There are alternative trade-offs. And the alternative trade-off is simply one which recognizes applied research on a scholarly basis. I'm not talking about a second class citizen, necessarily, but recognizing applied research as a legitimate role of faculty who are interested in that area and are capable, along with the kind of research that is traditionally thought about at the university as the one commanding the highest respect, namely, peer group acceptance.

Graham Watt:

Let me suggest that when we think about mechanisms, we distinguish in our own minds mechanisms at the local level and mechanisms at some more global level, presumably a national mechanism. In my relationship with this project as it has been developing I know that there are some plans afoot within AASCU that relate to the issue, the matter of national mechanism and I think it's appropriate at this time to review these.

Concluding Discussion:

At this point, the general discussion terminated and Dr. Clark Ahlberg and Allan Ostar again outlined AASCU's interest as the lead educational association, in developing a national Office of Urban Affairs and Public Service in collaboration with participating public interest groups. It was suggested that this office receive program guidance from an advisory group and provide staff assistance to begin developing action programs of the type discussed in the conference and outlined in the planning proposal. The basic purpose of the office would be to improve higher education's response to the needs of state and local governments, with specific programs to be worked out in further consultation with members of the workshop and potential granting agencies.

The workshop participants endorsed the AASCU plans for the development of such an office and agreed to support any proposals requesting three to five year funding of such a collaborative effort. It was agreed that AASCU would be responsible for this development with ICMA assistance and that key groups would be contacted for additional program planning and specific project proposal endorsements as they developed.

Luncheon Session
January 7, 1976 Afternoon

Clark Ahlberg:

It seems only appropriate, wise and prudent that we ask Robert Crawford, Director of the Intergovernmental Programs at the National Science Foundation, for his comments. He's been with us here today and he is responsible for much of the quality of this program. We would like for Bob to give us a few observations.

Robert Crawford:

I was impressed with the session this morning. I am sorry that John McGwire, our program manager for this activity, could not be with us due to an untimely illness. I know he regrets missing the workshop.

I'm also impressed by the quality of the individuals involved in this activity, and with the obvious interest and enthusiasm displayed this morning. I thought you might be interested in knowing what the NSF charter is in this area and why we're interested and involved.

We have the luxury of not being tied to a particular mission. As a result we tend to look around at the total system. In the Intergovernmental Program of the Foundation, we're particularly interested in how one mobilizes scientific and technological resources of all kinds to try to bring them to bear on the problems being faced by state and local governments.

At the same time, we work with certain local governments to help them improve their understanding of and ability in this area. Universities represent a fantastic potential.

One of the advantages of being in this program in the Foundation is that one has the opportunity to work with an extremely wide range of people and all parts of the institutions system. One of the disadvantages if that you are spread so thin in terms of interest you are usually the least informed about a given subject in which you are involved. I realize that in this group there are people who have been dealing with the various communities, one or more of them, for as many as 20 or 30 or 40 years. You know we're very supportive and very involved. We don't intend to imply in any way that the NSF has all the answers. We view our role as a facilitating one to try to help interested parties to get together. We all probably agree that in this area of academic public service no one has all the answers. The system is just so complex that we can't possibly know all there is to know. We can't possibly be aware of all the experiences that have been happening for the period of 60 and more years around the country in agriculture or municipal technical advisory services or in some of the more recent projects started under various kinds of sponsorships.

Federal agencies, mission agencies and many non-mission agencies have been in this business of trying to facilitate relationships of this sort for a long, long time. The basic question is why do we worry about this problem at all. Is it even in the national interest to do so? The consensus here seems to be that it is. And I agree.

This is one of those few things that we're involved in which nobody can lose. The universities are served by this kind of activity. The individual faculty members that want to be involved are served by making that more possible. The cities and the states certainly profit by good inputs from sources that they would not otherwise have. The Federal Government certainly prospers from adding additional resources in dealing with problems in terms of achieving national goals.

Our particular interest in the Foundation in the Intergovernmental Programs area is to facilitate parts of the system getting together.

A number of the professional societies, primarily some of the hard science and technology societies like IEEE and SME, have joined together in AILE, which is a consortium, to try to bring to bear their membership inputs into local and state policy making and operations. Their particular focus at this point is the State Legislature in New York and they are going into other states. They are working in close conjunction with Bill Carry and the AAAS to get this done. Other resources are the Federal laboratories around the country. Fifty-five of them at this point have organized themselves into a consortium to see how their technologies can be applied to domestic sector problems. It originally started with about 15 labs and has grown to 55 representing three or four federal agencies. Our Office of Intergovernmental Programs provides the secretariat function for this. We are about to undertake an evaluation and analysis of how fruitful this has been, and what directions might be applied in the future. This is a hot issue. Lots of groups are interested in seeing how these resources can be brought to bear in the national interest.

Undoubtedly, it takes many many pieces to get the system totally in tune. What you're talking about here will not supplant anything but will complement and add a necessary focus at the national level. A joint focus, between the interested groups that will facilitate the kinds of specific relationships among the state executive branches, the state legislatures, and the local governments that many universities have underway now, and will possibly undertake in the future, is needed very much.

I thought the suggestions in terms of what could be done were most interesting. The capturing of experience was certainly valid.

In addition, I would urge that whatever you do as a joint undertaking, focus on exploring the consensus in the community outside of the group that was represented here at this meeting. It's important that the communities that you represent be a factor in any future programs.

By way of conclusion, it appears that what you're going to undertake needs a name. My son in 9th grade has a 7th period thing called Interact, where people get together and talk together and try and make sure that everybody communicates to minimize the problems of the students and the faculty. I might suggest that as a possible name. Interact - a consortium of higher education and state and local governments for the common good. I think it's a good start, and you ought to view this as a start from the standpoint of the NSF in our role as a facilitator. I'd encourage you to explore this. We will do everything we can to support this and, I would say in the words of other representatives, including a couple of the executive directors of the public interest groups, no commitment of funds at this point.

Clark Ahlberg:

It's a great personal pleasure to ask the Dean of the Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, a former neighbor of mine, Alan Campbell, or Scotty, as we all know him, to sum up his impressions of what has happened the past day and a half.

Scotty Campbell:

Let me begin by saying that I think the set of papers prepared for this conference are themselves a good summary. I don't believe that there was anything said during the course of the morning which in one way or another was not touched upon in those papers. They cover the subject succinctly and well. We also have the tape of the meeting and those who will follow up on this conference can turn to that for the specific suggestions made during the course of the meeting.

I was concerned in the beginning of our session that we were going to become involved in the normal kind of academic-practitioner quarrel, about who's at fault for what. That fortunately didn't last very long. This is a measure of the progress which has been made in the relationships of these two communities over the past few years.

This approach, however, did not eliminate the need to discuss why past efforts to bring universities and urban governments into closer working relationship have often failed to work well. The evidence of these past difficulties is discussed in the papers prepared for this meeting, and in two reports by Bill Pendleton, which summarize well some of the disappointments that the Ford Foundation had with its major grants in this field. Therefore it is appropriate to ask why the past failures and why is it thought possible we will not repeat them.

It doesn't seem to me that we answered with precision the questions as to why we have had failures. It was pointed out that perhaps the early use of the county agent analogy was inappropriate and therefore our expectations were wrong. Also, the mood in the country may not have been right at that time for the types of interactions we thought possible. It is also likely that there was a misunderstanding on the part of the practitioner world of how much, in fact, academics know, how helpful they can be.

But perhaps, more important was the point that there have been successes and that we should examine them. Not all the urban observatories, for example, failed. There are still several that are alive and doing well. Not all of the extension type programs that Ford supported have disappeared. Some continue to operate and are making valuable contributions.

There is a tendency in areas where one is attempting to improve processes rather than products to assume failures, largely, because it is difficult to measure success. You don't have a product about which you can say, look, we produced this. There is no way to really get a good measure of when, in fact, something works if the "working" relates to improving process and procedures.

Nonetheless, it was pointed out that the situation has changed. There is a greater desire on both sides now for the kinds of interactions that were discussed.

There are two reasons for this change. One is the financial situation in which many universities find themselves. They see the kind of outreach activity discussed at our meeting as a means of supplementing those resources. By the same token, state and local government units also find themselves increasingly under fiscal constraints. It may be that they hope to be able to go to the universities and acquire some free services which will help them with their fiscal problems. How those two drives are going to work themselves out I'm not certain, but it is creating an environment in which we are talking with each other.

There is something more important happening. That is the change in the intellectual environment within the university and, more generally, within the country. The very fact the number of young persons who are going into the training programs for public service has tripled over the last five or six years, is one measure of that change in attitude.

Incidentally this increase in students is not a product of the downturn in the economy. That increase began before the recession. It has something to do with the kind of commitment that was expressed in the late 60's in other ways and which has been translated into more establishment oriented activities.

I'm sure, too, that many faculty members have become less convinced that grand solutions for social problems will work, and are much more willing to look at solutions from an incremental point of view. This more modest approach causes faculty and students to be more acceptable to public officials.

There is also a new receptiveness by public officials as a result of increasing contacts with the academic community. And those contacts get increasingly easier as more and more public officials themselves come out of the academic programs which are today training people for the public service.

Difficulties, however, remain. There was a frank facing up to those difficulties this morning. It was pointed out that the reward system for faculty members is not in tune with the kind of services we were discussing today. That is not as big a problem today as it was ten or fifteen years ago. Nevertheless it still remains a necessity for universities, if they are to get deeply involved with this kind of activity to recognize it as an appropriate role for a professor. It's not enough that presidents and deans become convinced of this, because they are not the ones who make decisions important to faculty members. Those decisions are made by colleagues and, therefore, it is the faculty which must believe that working with the practitioner would be as useful as having an article published in the American Economic Review or wherever.

There is another problem on the university side, namely, a lack of administrator control of the time of faculty members. And that's not going to change. A variety of inducements developed through cooperative, jointly-arrived-at decisions will be required.

And, finally, on the university side, there is the difficulty of financial arrangements between the university and the faculty member and the financial arrangement between the university and the governmental jurisdiction which wishes to use the services of the university. This cannot be left to chance or to ad hoc relations. One thing that could help would be for the university and the government to sit down together to develop something like the Kalamazoo arrangement which was described this morning.

On the practitioner side, one difficulty relates to the different time span in which the public official operates. Another is that his expectations are too high, in relation to what, in fact, can be provided by the university and its people. Finally, there is his fear of controversy. This fear that controversy may grow out of what is discovered about the operation of a particular jurisdiction or agency by outsiders, i.e., by faculty-student research teams. This problem is never going to go away. The public official simply has to learn to live with it.

On the other hand, faculty members should not assume that their role is to embarrass public officials.

I do not think we did a very good job of defining what services state and local government jurisdictions want, or need. We tended to just take that as given. A real effort to spell out needs and the relationship of them to university resources must be made.

We also were not very clear about what it is faculty members want to do. It may be that, in some instances, it's not university personnel who are relevant. It may be the secondary schools in some cases and in others a consulting firm, as well as other community resources. There is no reason to expect that there will be any big turn around in the kind of things in which faculty members are interested and only when these are defined and understood will it be possible for them to make a substantial contribution.

It would be helpful therefore if we did try, as a first step in this process, to determine what is needed, to do some classifying, and to spell out specific projects.

There is a distinction between the application of already existing knowledge about which there is general agreement and the development of new knowledge. What is needed more than anything else is to involve people from the practical world on research teams with academics in order that a new kind of perspective can be brought to those research undertakings which are expanding the body of knowledge available.

Another useful distinction can be made between assistance for improving process and for doing policy analysis. Normally assistance about process raises less political controversy than policy help. It is also important to distinguish between training and research. Thus far success has been greater with training than with research.

Finally there is the question of what can be done at the national level by national associations. What must be remembered is that no national effort is worth anything unless it helps develop working relationships at the operating level, i.e., between a campus and community organization. Case studies of successful undertakings would be useful as would the development of models of relationships which practice or logic suggest are workable.

The primary need is to move from abstract generalizations about the need for cooperation to very specific empirical analysis of what is needed and what kind of institutional arrangements are likely to serve the interest of both practitioner and academic.

WORKSHOP

APPENDIX

List of Participants

Background Papers & Authors

Summary

A WORKSHOP TO CONSIDER THE DEVELOPMENT OF A COOPERATIVE ACTION PROGRAM IN URBAN AFFAIRS AND ACADEMIC PUBLIC SERVICE

January 6 and 7, 1976

INVITATIONS TO ATTEND

* AHLBERG, CLARK D.
Chairman, AASCU COMMITTEE ON URBAN AFFAIRS
President, Wichita State University
Wichita, Kansas

BEALS, L. ALAN
Executive Vice President
NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES
1620 Eye Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

* BERLIN, SEYMOUR S.
Executive Director
AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION
1225 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

* BESUDEN, WILLIAM
Assistant Director
INTERNATIONAL CITY MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATION
1140 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

* BEYLE, THAD L.
Director of Center for Policy Research and Analysis
NATIONAL GOVERNORS CONFERENCE
1150 - 17th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

* BIRKHEAD, GUTHRIE
Chairman, Urban Affairs Section
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS & ADMINISTRATION
1225 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

* BISCOE, A.B.
Associate Vice President for Public Affairs
UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE
Knoxville, Tennessee

* BLANDIN, DON M.
Staff Director, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS & ADMINISTRATION
1225 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

* FISHER, GLENN
Regents Professor of Urban Affairs
WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY
Wichita, Kansas 67208

* FRATKIN, SUSAN
Director, Special Programs
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE UNIVERSITIES
AND LAND-GRANT COLLEGES
One Dupont Circle, Suite 710
Washington, D.C. 20036

* FREDERICKSON, GEORGE H.
Dean, School of Social & Community Service
University of Missouri-Columbia
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS OF PUBLIC
AFFAIRS AND ADMINISTRATION
Columbia, Missouri 65201

* FULKERSON, WILLIAM M.
Associate Executive Director
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE COLLEGES
AND UNIVERSITIES
One Dupont Circle, Suite 700
Washingron, D.C. 20036

* GALLAGHER, HUBERT R.
Special Assistant
COUNCIL OF STATE GOVERNMENTS
c/o ASPA, 1225 Connecticut Aven., N.W.
Washington, D.C.

* GARDNER, HARRY M.
Director, Office of External Relations
UNITED STATES OFFICE OF EDUCATION/HEALTH,
EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Room 4009, FOB #6
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

GILLEY, WADE J.
President
J. Sargent Reynolds Community College
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COMMUNITY AND
JUNIOR COLLEGES
P.O. Box 6935
Richmond, Virginia 23230

GUNTHER, JOHN J.
Executive Director
NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF MAYORS
1620 "I" Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

* MAGILL, SAMUEL
Program Associate
ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES
1818 "R" Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

* MAHARAY, GEORGE
Secretariat to the Consortium on
Education for the Public Service
AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION
1125 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

MCGWIRE, JOHN
Program Manager for Intergovernmental Programs
NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION
1800 "G" Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20550

* MILLER, LYNN
Coordinator, Urban Management Education
INTERNATIONAL CITY MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATION
1140 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

* MULLIN, JOSEPH
Special Assistant, Community Affairs
NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF STATE LEGISLATURES
1150 - 17th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

NESS, FREDERICK
President
ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES
1818 "R" Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

ORLEBEKE, CHARLES
Assistant Secretary for Policy R&D
DEPT. OF HOUSING & URBAN DEVELOPMENT
300 Independence Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20410

* OSMAN, JOHN
Member, Senior Staff
BROOKINGS INSTITUTION
1775 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

* OSTAR, ALLAN W.
Executive Director
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE COLLEGES
AND UNIVERSITIES
One Dupont Circle, Suite 700
Washinton, D.C. 20036

* STANFIELD, ROCHELLE
Associate Program Director
Leadership Institute
U.S. CONFERENCE OF MAYORS
1620 "I" Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

* SUDERMANN, FREDERICK
AASCU-ICMA Project Consultant
Director, Office of Research and
Sponsored Programs
WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY
Wichita, Kansas 67208

* VENUTO, LOUIS
Program Manager, Public Service Education
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
ROB #3, Room 4676
7th & "D" Streets, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

* WATT, GRAHAM
President
NATIONAL TRAINING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICE
5028 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20016

* WELDEN, J. EUGENE
Chief, Community Services & Continuing Educ.
Division of Training & Facilities
UNITED STATES OFFICE OF EDUCATION
7th & "D" Streets, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

* WILLIAMS, JAMES
City Manager
SANTA MONICA, CALIFORNIA

* WILLIAMS, LARRY
Director, Urban Observatory
NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES
1620 "I" Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

WORMALD, F.L.
Vice President
ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES
1818 "R" Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

* YARRINGTON, ROGER
Vice President
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COMMUNITY AND
JUNIOR COLLEGES
One Dupont Circle, Suite 410
Washington, D.C. 20036

* Attendees

BACKGROUND PAPERS

AND AUTHORS

Alvin B. Biscoe, Jr., Associate Vice-President for Public Service, The University of Tennessee
Academic Institutions and Public Interest Groups--A Pragmatic Approach to a Cooperative Action Program

Alvin B. Biscoe, Jr., Associate Vice President for Public Service, The University of Tennessee, received his B.A. from the University of Georgia, his MBA at the University of Chicago, and his Ph.D. at the University of Florida. Dr. Biscoe has served in various administrative positions at the University of Tennessee. Before assuming his present position, Dr. Biscoe was the Executive Director of the Universities Institute for Public Service. He has been involved in sponsored research with the National Science Foundation and has published in the field of government financing.

James L. Caplinger, Director of Professional Public Consultants
The City and the Community

James L. Caplinger, City Manager of Kalamazoo, Michigan, has a B. A. from Ohio State University and a JD from Ohio State Law School. He was city attorney of Springfield, Ohio from 1962 to 1963, then City Manager of Springfield from 1965 to 1968, and was Kalamazoo City Manager from 1968 to 1974. Since 1974 he has been Director of Professional Public Consultants, Inc. of Kalamazoo. Mr. Caplinger is on the ICMA Education Committee and is a member of the joint ICMA/NASPAA project committee.

Glenn W. Fisher, Regents Professor of Urban Affairs, Wichita State University.
Internal Obstacles to Successful Programs in Urban Affairs and Academic Public Service

Glenn W. Fisher is Regents Professor of Urban Affairs, Wichita State University. He received his B. A. at the University of Iowa, his M. A. at the University of North Carolina, and his Ph.D. from the University of Wisconsin (all in Economics). He has served as Professor of Political Science and Professor of Government and Public Affairs at the University of Illinois (1961-1970). He has served on numerous study and research committees and has published dozens of articles in the field of taxation, state and local government financing.

John Osman, Fellow, Brookings Institution
A New Civics for the New Urbanization

John Osman is a Member of the Senior Staff of the Brookings Institution. He is an economic historian, specializing in the economic evolution of cities. He has spent the past fifteen years at Brookings organizing the results of urban and regional research and directing the Urban Policy Conference Program, which disseminates this research to public officials and civic leaders with public policy responsibilities.

ACADEMIC INSTITUTIONS AND PUBLIC INTEREST GROUPS-- A PRAGMATIC APPROACH TO A COOPERATIVE ACTION PROGRAM

Dr. A. B. Biscoe, Jr.* **

The proposal that associations representing institutions of higher education and associations representing public officials plan and implement a cooperative action program in urban affairs and academic public service faces several hurdles which must be overcome if higher education is to serve state and local government more effectively.

At least four major premises underlie the proposal. First, colleges and universities, by virtue of their instruction, research and service missions and the resources to conduct them, have substantial although perhaps latent capability in state and local government matters. Second, government officials and their constituents have great problems and hence great need for academic capabilities which can define problems, conduct research, and identify the consequences of alternative courses of action. Third, the route to more effective interaction between academic institutions and state and local government begins at the level of national associations. Fourth, there is an existing or a potential community of interest among education associations and public interest groups in the area of urban affairs and academic public service of sufficient strength to generate both a partial reshaping of educational priorities and reassessment of the attitudes of officialdom toward academe.

All of these premises are partially true. It is the remainder that have led to the seemingly endless and repetitive series of conferences and debates in the past five or so years on the role of higher education in urban affairs and public service.

Higher education does in fact command an unduplicable set of knowledge resources, both nationally and in the individual states. To say that these resources are or should be available for a particular purpose in a specific place at a specific time is naive unless the ground rules and limits have been determined through legitimate processes and are well understood.

State and local government officials and their constituents do face horrendous problems (and correspondingly large opportunities) but as yet they do not look to academe consistently as a problem-solving resource.

National associations of academic and public institutions can play an effective role in planning and implementing the proposed cooperative action program, but they can do so only with effective two-way linkages with and commitments from their constituent members and each other.

---

*The author notes that another paper has been commissioned on the same subject but "as seen by practitioners." The need to do so speaks volumes about the problems inherent in academic public service.

**Associate Vice President for Public Service, The University of Tennessee

National associations of academic and public institutions do have a community of interest. Presently it is only at the most casual level, proceeding largely in terms such as "you know we really ought to...." In reality, each association or interest group has a generous supply of purebred oxen and wholly-owned ditches which prevail in commanding attention over the mixed strains and joint tenancy arrangements.

Nevertheless, the view is being expressed with increasing urgency that universities, those unique and unduplicable reservoirs of human capability, should return a dividend on society's huge investments in them by helping people solve the pressing problems in our times and realize their opportunities for improvement.* Academe should be as helpful for community-dwellers as it has been for farmers. Academic public service is a primary route to credibility in an era of accountability.

Unfortunately the record, with some outstanding exceptions, has not been good. This is offered as a truism which is the sine qua non of the proposed cooperative action program.

It is difficult to explain by traditional means the modest contribution of higher education to the solution of urban ills. The need for more skillfully designed and administered academic programs is well recognized. Money and commitment also have been present at certain places and at certain times. The Ford Foundation's urban affairs program was terminated recently after a 20 year - $36,000,000 investment in learning that academe has not helped cities much.

The first impediment to a successful relationship between academe and urban areas is that the problems are damn tough! Second is that the accomplishments by which some tend to judge "success" are not realistic.

---

*See as examples:

Power to the States: Mobilizing Public Technology, the Council of State Governments, 1972. pp. 41-46 of Summary Report.

Public Technology: A Tool for Solving National Problems, Report of the Committee on Intergovernmental Science Relations to the Federal Council for Science and Technology, 1972. p. 7.

The Academic Community: A Backup Force to State Government, Southern Regional Education Board, 1974.

A Question of Partnership: Institutions of Higher Education as a Resource in the Solution of National Problems, National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.

President's Message on Science and Technology to the Congress, Richard M. Nixon, March 16, 1972, H. Doc. No. 92-193.

For example, has academe solve the ghetto problem, eliminated poverty, provided healthy environments, furnished limitless energy or found mass transportation at reasonable cost which uses little fuel and emits no pollutants? Academe will never be successful in terms of achieving quick and comprehensive solutions on the scale implied here because: a) the problems are political as well as academic; and b) they are not problems at all. They are complex universes composed of myriad short and long-run problems and issues which must be understood and attacked over a period of time, as has been true in any major academic success story from agriculture to aerospace. Moreover, the acceptability of proposed solutions is governed by the goals held by differing and oftentimes competing elements of society. Third is a lack of internal organization among suppliers and users of "urban knowledge and methodologies" for problem-solving purposes. Fourth is a lack of external communication leading to mutually supportive understanding between academe and officialdom. And fifth, the incentives for individual suppliers and users of urban problem-solving technologies are vague.

With this stark background, which hopefully is fair in broad outline, where are the pressure points for encouraging colleges and universities to address more effectively the problems of American communities? Basically, they lie in five domains of such importance that any strategy must include them all.

1. Higher education associations
2. Public interest groups
3. Individual colleges and universities
4. State and local government officials, including legislators
5. The federal government

These five domains are dissimilar in many respects and are somewhat heterogeneous internally. However, they do face some common hurdles in the area of "addressing more effectively the problems of American communities."

In general, the main hurdles they share are as follows, each of which requires new strategies and incentives to overcome.

The first hurdle is definitional. What does "more effective" mean? What are the success criteria? At what point will higher education have met or begun to meet, its obligations to American communities and how are the varying degrees of success along the way measured?

Second, what are the organizational and communication channels implied by a cooperative action program among education associations and public interest groups?

Third, how is commitment to serve and be served generated and sustained?

Several biases will permeate the following discussion of these three hurdles. They are revealed at the outset in hopes of offsetting opinionatedness with fairness.

1. The role of the national associations is limited. They can elevate the debate to national visibility, a not insignificant contribution. They can coagulate opinion and convert it to policy. They can seek resources. They can stimulate discussion and enthusiasm at working levels. They can recommend the shape of programs. But they cannot teach courses, award degrees, offer public service or, in the case of the public interest groups, identify the needs of a particular community, hire the graduates, or implement the recommendations of experts on better ways to govern.

2. Work is done at the local level. A national effort is likely to remain in the status of "conversation" unless the effort includes ways to get work done.

3. Work done by universities traditionally and necessarily is determined and implemented by faculty. When national associations seek to assert leadership in what the institutions do, means must be present to generate faculty commitment.

4. Mayors, county officials, governors, and legislators will determine largely what should be done for them. National associations and faculty generally will not, either in terms of types of graduates hired or public service received and implemented.

Assuming the correctness of these assertions in the present context, the discussion now proceeds to three major hurdles standing in the way of a cooperative action program. The essence is that "definition" is the initial key to "communication" and "commitment."

Definition

Many of us have a positive notion of the universities' role in urban affairs and academic public service. Often these notions are expressed in vague generalities which hide rather than reveal basic underlying differences of opinion. Included in this general indictment are members of the university community who are involved and who meet at least occasionally to exchange information and viewpoints.

Several years ago some of the federal agencies were fond of meeting with university representatives to discuss why so few people trained in public administration were engaged in public administration. The presumption now is that education and training in urban affairs may not produce more highly skilled practitioners in urban affairs without considerable prior thought about the kinds of graduates needed by communities.

Faculty with leanings toward instruction and more-or-less pure research often fear they will be forced into a service mode without adequate local and

and national recognition. Administrations fear politicalization of the university, not to mention undesirable skewing of resource allocations away from instruction and research toward practical matters.

Practitioners often fear the university; or recognize little chance of being able to communicate with it and vice versa; or are convinced, sometimes through experience, that the university will not be interested in their specific problem, willing to work in a practical time frame, or willing to limit consideration to alternatives which are politically and financially realistic.

And yet, as a general theme and underlying premise of the proposed cooperative program, many people appear convinced that universities can serve cities and cities need them to do so.

Recommendations

The higher education associations, the public interest groups, and the federal government should sponsor a well planned series of inquiries, debates and studies leading to a major joint policy statement on the potential for university service to communities through teaching, research, and service. Within the next twelve to eighteen months we should a) define what we are and what we are not talking about; b) state specifically why academe should or should not be involved more productively in urban affairs and academic public service; c) suggest some appropriate and realizable goals from both the suppliers' and the users' point of view; and d) outline some specific ways to attempt to reach the goals.

The policy statement and its underpinnings should be undertaken collaboratively by representatives of academe and officialdom. It should identify the pluses and minuses on both sides of the fence for more effective service to communities.

It should clarify the roles of each of the five major groups of participants listed above and any "office" or "focal point" established to spearhead the program. It should pay particular attention to concerns at the campus and state and local government levels. And it should identify alternative levels of accomplishment to be sought according to various assumed levels of resource availability.

In short, until we know what we are really talking about with some precision, it will be difficult to communicate it or gain commitment for the concept. The uncertainties surrounding the idea of serving cities better are an open invitation to continue to feel comfortable in doing what we are now doing in the associations, on campus and in city hall.

Communication

The need for effective communications goes well beyond that involving higher education associations and public interest groups. In fact, over a period of time, good communication here will tend to be the result rather than the cause of good communication elsewhere.

"Elsewhere" includes the following: association with association; interest group with interest group; all of these with their constituents; all of these with the federal government; presidents with vice presidents, deans, department heads and faculty; mayors with councilmen and department heads; and campuses with mayors, governors, heads of executive departments, and legislators.

If the chain is broken before the local or service level is reached, all that is left is executive secretary talking with executive secretary.

In addition to the extent of communication needed, the quality of communication must be considered. In developing or revitalizing a "new" area of programmatic concern, communication is far more complex than agreeing or disagreeing on, for example, a revenue sharing bill, an HEW appropriation, or a Title IX requirement. Communications on serving cities through a cooperative action program will be continuing, will involve the resolution of varied interests, will be oriented toward generating commitment and sharing results over a period of time, will involve the shaping and reshaping of programs, and will incorporate feedback mechanisms for identifying and bringing about needed improvements.

Recommendations

Establish a formal communication system in advance through legitimate and recognized processes. Decide on the location, size, shape and functions of a focal point for the cooperative action program through a process which involves all relevant groups in the management structures of the sponsoring associations and the interest groups. Identify contact points through whic continuing communications can be maintained among the sponsors and the foca point and among the sponsors and their respective constituents.

Identify formally one or more recognized contact points in the fede government.

Seek commitments from the sponsoring organizations to plan and imp ment a communications network which involves the working levels in a si cant manner.

As an initial test of the communications mechanisms, use them to and produce the series of inquiries, debates, and studies and the joi statement recommended above.

Commitment

Of all the commitments that could be made, only two are of enduring value—the commitment of faculty to engage in education and research in urban affairs and in academic public service and the commitment of state and local officials to give active consideration to hiring graduates and using the research and service.

Although a period of effective leadership at the national level may produce some interim successes, lasting success will be generated locally. When this occurs, lasting commitment at the national level will tend to follow.

Two of the studies contemplated in the first recommendation would address the ways and means to generate commitment at the two local levels. These would not have to be based entirely on original research but could draw heavily from, for example, the experiments underway in the National Science Foundation's Experimental R & D Incentives Program. This program includes intensive consideration of such things as barriers to the flow of applied technology imposed by both universities and governments. Understanding these barriers and a willingness to attempt to overcome them are imperative to a cooperative action program.

Recommendation

Building balanced commitments at the local level involves adding new priorities or shifting old ones. This is not a short-run process. Moreover, it assumes the accomplishment of the recommendations already proposed.

The only specific recommendation offered here is that commitment building must be the number one priority of the focal point for the cooperative action program and high on each sponsor's list. The other recommendations should be implemented in a way that encourages and facilitates building balanced commitments among all five categories of participants. Relationships with federal agencies, foundations and others should be orientated toward finding resources that support commitment building. And, finally, despite the urgent need for new resources, they are so scarce at this time that commitments to do the best we can with what we have should be emphasized.

THE CITY AND THE UNIVERSITY

James L. Caplinger

There has been frequent discussion over the past several years about the "urban crisis" in America. Typically, speakers identify the underlying reasons for this crisis as flowing from a lack of adequate amounts of money for local governments to deal with their problems and with the needs of citizens. Yet even when increased sums of money have been provided, the component problems of the current crisis have not generally dissipated. We need only review the results of the "Great Society" programs or the results of federal and state revenue sharing programs to reach this conclusion.

Obviously, factors such as new technology, existing technology from other fields such as the space program, understanding what motivates the human being, dealing with a fragmented local government system that requires unified answers, and many others have a role to play in resolving our "urban crisis," so we can move onto building a more nearly perfect society that is peaceful and that permits all to realize their potential. Is not this our democratic hope for ourselves and our cities and our country? Maybe even for our world?

It is apparent to most observers that an individual city government can never have all the resources and all the expertise necessary to conduct the theoretical and the practical research necessary to begin systematically to solve our very basic problems. Often, there is not even a commitment by policy makers and administrators in cities to the need for such research.

Yet there exist all over our country universities staffed with professional people -- teachers and researchers -- who together might well fill the expertise gap that plagues our cities. Seldom, though, does the university form a continuing relationship with a specific government to approach jointly the resolution of problems. Why is this the case?

Let us begin by examining the respective roles of cities and universities. The city if a governmental agency established as a creature of the state to govern; to maintain the peace; to provide services for people that cannot otherwise be provided; to provide services that the people desire. In carrying out this function, city government needs a wide range of specific expert assistance. For example, advice is needed from physical scientists concerning water tables, sewage treatment, and chemical analysis for the police department to name only a few examples. Professional expertise is needed in the areas of public health, legal services, and many other such areas. Social scientists become involved in many respects. To give one example, efforts to attempt to develop a consensus of the citizenry within a governmental unit obviously have ramifications for sociologists, psychologists, and others. In the past. more relationships have developed between municipal governments and schools of public administration. However, the expertise needed by cities in dealing with problems extend far beyond the range of expertise available on the faculties of the typical schools of public administration. Generally, the kind of expertise described above is not available on the administrative staff of any city. Often, all city administrators work in the final analysis as operatives trying to provide line services. They do not have the breadth necessary to provide the full array of expert opinions needed to consider all the options available in combating the "urban crisis". In addition, it does not make economic sense to have an expert on the staff who may be needed only occasionally. Therefore, the city administrator finds that he or she must frequently employ outside consulting assistance. This normally takes the shape of an individual college professor or a professional consulting firm. Parenthetically, I might add that the professor is often involved with the consulting firm so that even when the firm is used, there is an indirect relationship with academe. Later on, we shall explore the problems of this kind of consulting approach to problem solving. However, it should be pointed out here that there is a need for the balance of the theoretician in conjunction with the work of the practical administrator.

What then is the role of the university. The mission of the university can be broken into three parts as follows:

A. Instruction

B. Research

C. Service

Unfortunately service to the community or to society has too frequently become a step-child, because the university reward system for faculty members relates to their instructional abilities and their research accomplishments rather than to their service achievements. However, the university often needs the city in carrying out its mission. For example, the researcher—particularly in the social sciences — often needs the city as a laboratory. The academic often needs the practical knowledge that can be given to him or her by the city administrator. In like fashion, the instructional part of the mission can often use the city organization, for example, as a placement mechanism for student interns. It is the thesis of this paper that the university would benefit by extending its service mission to assume co-equal status with its instructional and its research undertakings. There is little reason why the service function cannot be related to professional or programmatic goals of the university.

Given the discussion above about the basic mission of the city and the basic mission of the university, it would appear that a cooperative approach utilizing the needs and strengths of each could be advantageous to both. However, in the past such cooperative ventures have not evolved very often. Where they have, they have tended to depend upon a continuation in office of the personnel in each institution who started the cooperative venture. In other words, frequently such cooperative ventures have not been institutionalized. In addition, it might be stated that there are various reasons why such cooperative approaches have not often developed. A few of these are listed as follows:

A. Universities increasingly are faced with the same lack of resources that has characterized cities. This is true not only of the private institution but also of many large state universities which have faced budget cuts in our recent uncertain economy.

B. Frequently individual professors have preferred not to see cooperative ventures develop between cities and universities, because such institutionalization is construed as tending to limit their opportunities to perform consulting work or research as independent contractors. Frequently, a city administrator may approach a university for some kind of assistance only to be met with a request by a given faculty member that he or she be paid for the work requested. In some instances payment is appropriate but in other instances it is not. In any event, this tendency of academics to request such payment has tended to create a negative attitude on the part of many public administrators.

C. Often the practitioner who is concerned with mundane, routine, but very important day to day tasks, is somewhat "turned off" by the image of the academic as "far out" or "ivory tower." Certainly these terms do not apply to all people in the university. However, that is often the image. Familiarity as much as anything else will correct this image, but -- heretofore -- there has been little opportunity for the academic and the practitioner to meet on anything like equal terms. By and large they attend different professional meetings and write for and read different professional publications. These comments do not apply as well to the academic in the area of public administration as they do in other fields.

D. In the past there has been a lack of commonality between the university and the city. While the city typically has a central administration which coordinates the major thrusts of the city, the university does not. The world of academe values the independence of the individual professional. Thus it is difficult for the practitioner to know how to have access to the individual professor. As a matter of fact, the goals of the university and the city are somewhat different. The city administrator is interested in the results of particular research for help in solving specific problems. The researcher is also interested in that but in a larger sense is interested in what can be learned for future application or future theoretical development. There is little reason, though, why these goals cannot be harmonized. However, the university is a formidable enough institution that, typically, the administrator does not have the knowledge that is necessary to know how to get the appropriate individual within the university who can help with a given problem. In fact, the university itself often is not organized in such a fashion as to identify easily individuals who might help on specific problems.

E. In addition, it should be pointed out that in the past the academic has often not been willing to approach research with a city on a basis of equality. City administrators have disliked being accorded some kind of second class status in discussing research or in performing research for a given municipality. In fact, it is necessary to have the practitioner to help identify the problem and the academic to help structure the research. There would seem to be little reason why these two cannot operate as a team, each one of whom is an important ingredient in the final result.

F. It must be pointed out that the member schools of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities frequently have begun as teachers' institutions. This is a very specific mission. Although the statement may be an over generalization, it ought to be pointed out that historically research has not been considered as one of the strengths of the colleges and universities affiliated with the AASCU. This, therefore, has tended also to inhibit the development of cooperative ventures between the city and the university at least where an AASCU school has been involved.

Having engaged in the above general discussion, it is now the purpose of this paper to explore one cooperative approach that was structured in one city with one university. This cooperative approach was never implemented for reasons that will be discussed. However, it is the writer's opinion that the approach in question overcame many of the constraints to cooperation that have been discussed and, therefore, that it can serve as a valid model for experimentation for the future.

The writer became city manager of Kalamazoo, Michigan, in 1968. Kalamazoo is a city which has in or near it four institutions of higher learning. These are the following: (a) Western Michigan University, a large university offering degrees at the bachelors, masters, and doctorate level; (b) Nazareth College, formerly a Catholic Girls School that is now co-educational, a small liberal arts college; (c) Kalamazoo Valley Community College, a rather good sized community college; (d) Kalamazoo College which is the oldest college in the state of Michigan. This is a medium sized private liberal arts college that originally was founded by the Baptist Church and which has retained close ties with the city government and with the power structure within the community over the years.

The writer, on becoming city manager, determined that it would be desirable to try to create closer relationships between the education institutions and the city. Therefore, a number of programs were instituted which involved placing interns from the colleges in city departments, using individual college professors to consult on specific problems that the city had, having fairly regular meetings with university administrators in order to discuss problems that were common to the two, and encouraging social relationships between city administrators and university administrators and teachers. This kind of effort culminated in a workshop which can best be described as a brainstorming session. A number of city department heads were invited to a retreat along with selected professors and administrators from Western Michigan University. The purpose of the workshop was to begin to identify the unmet needs which the city administration saw before it. The further aim of the workshop was to discuss ways in which the resources of the university might be marshalled to begin dealing with some of those needs on a systematic basis. Out of this workshop grew a number of contacts. The following is merely illustrative:

A. One professor performed an economic analysis of a proposal to expand our airport and drew the conclusion that — on a cost/benefit basis -- the airport should not be expanded. Parenthetically, I might point out that, in my opinion, he reached the wrong conclusion. However, his work was then helpful in establishing a framework of discussion over the years.

B. Library assistance in pulling together materials that are of assistance at any given time to city administrators.

C. Assistance with forming and operating the regional organization in this area.

D. Specific planning assistance in working for a comprehensive plan in the community.

E. Having the Theatre Department of the university plan performances particularly for children in our parks along with the recreation programs.

F. The planning and implementation of a program to put murals throughout the downtown area. These murals all were intended to have some artistic value to them.

G. Scientific assistance in planning for the future utilization of water resources and in planning for sewage treatment.

H. Assistance in computer planning.

I. The Parks Department actually offered an undeveloped piece of ground to a class at Western to have that class develop a plan for the park which would be implemented if well done.

J. Certain assistance with testing in the personnel department and in the placement of interns.

K. Certain assistance in structuring the research department of the city.

L. The conducting of many studies in the police department in an era when the police department was under attack for not having good community relations.

M. Assistance with the community relations department of the city where the aid of sociologists and other social scientists proved to be invaluable in the work of the department attempting to improve relationships between various kinds of people in the community.

N. Assistance in such areas as charter revision and other work of this kind.

Thus, it is obvious that, in this community, there have been specific contacts over the years which have brought the university and the city into a rather close position.

It was then determined, however, that it was timely to develop a proposal which would institutionalize this kind of relationship and which would create mutually advantageous research for both the city and the university. The proposed Kalamazoo Center for Metropolitan Research provided:

Rationale: To provide for ongoing university-city liaison for urban area problem solving, and coordinate disparate, single purpose studies.
To provide academics with access to primary data in the urban governmental system.

Organizing Principle:

- a joint undertaking for city of Kalamazoo and Western Michigan University
- provide a stable demand base for utilizing academic resources with mutual definition of work needs and incentives

- the contract does not limit the freedom of the city or university to negotiate separate consulting contracts
- to provide research utilization through appropriate policy council and support staff.

The advantages of the proposal included above can in part be described as follows:

A. There is running through the proposal a tenor of equality between the city administrator and the university academic or researcher. This is important if the academic is to be accepted in city hall.

B. There is the provision of a repository for materials developed so that they do not get lost by being stored in individual administrators' offices or in individual professors' offices or homes. There is a place for collection of relevant materials.

C. The proposal creates a coordinating office to tie the university together and to provide the access point for the administrator.

D. There is a method developed for the identification of needs in a way that will make it possible to tie those needs to the potential answers that can be developed through systematic research by the university.

E. There is a team approach which can be noted flowing through the proposal.

F. Since research will probably be successful only in an atmosphere of mutual trust, the thrust of the proposal has been to create an agency with appropriate control but also with appropriate opportunities for contact in order to develop this kind of trust.

G. While the proposal envisions one university and one city, there is no reason why later it cannot be expanded, after proving itself successful, to other governmental units and even conceivably to other universities. It is the writer's opinion, however, that there are enough constraints to cooperative ventures between cities and universities without adding the additional complicating factor of multiple governmental units at the outset which units may not have totally consistent goals. Thus, it was proposed that the largest government unit in the area develop a relationship with the largest university in the area, which relationship then later could easily be expanded to include other governmental units and perhaps even other schools.

This proposal was never implemented. Why? The proposal was developed jointly by the city administration and a number of academicians and administrators at Western Michigan University. Particularly involved in pushing the concept from the university were the Associate Dean of the Graduate School and the Vice President for Academic Affairs. From the city perspective, probably the strongest proponents were the City Manager and the Director of the Research Bureau. This Director was not a department head but was an administrative assistant to the City Manager. Ultimately, the Board of Trustees of Western Michigan University approved the proposal. At this point the City Commission of the City of Kalamazoo began showing concern about the proposal and ultimately rejected it. It appeared that the following were factors in the rejection of the City Commission:

A. Another college in the city which perceived itself as having had over the years a "special relationship" with the city, discreetly and behind the scenes, made known certain reservations about formalization of contacts like this with the large state university. The contacts appeared effective in persuading one or more city commissioners that they ought to oppose the entire concept.

B. In addition, some academics from Western Michigan University also approached individual city commissioners suggesting that the proposal would limit contacts that had already been built up over the years. This approach to individual city commissioners also appeared to carry weight in the ultimate rejection.

C. The third factor is, in the writer's opinion, a fear on the part of the city commission that the city manager was becoming too powerful an individual in the entire governmental system. Certain members of the city commission saw this kind of proposal as adding greatly to the power and to the influence of the city manager as compared with the city commission.

In spite of the rejection, which appeared to be for reasons other than the basic soundness of the proposal, it is the view of the writer that this is one of the few truly innovative models that has been developed to try to create a spirit of cooperation between the city and the university.

It is the feeling, both of the writer who was involved in development of this proposal and of the high-level university administrators who were involved in the development of this proposal, that the success of the proposal depends not so much on citizen support as it does on the support of the key people within the administration of the university and the administration of the city. The final question is what kind of tone are they setting? In conclusion, it should be pointed out that the proposal discussed in this paper is intended to bring one government and one university -- or at most a series of governments in one geographical area — into a regularized relationship with one or more colleges or universities within the same geographical area. While this approach or one like it may begin to create effective utilization of the resources of the university in dealing with the problems of the cities that have been referred to as the "urban crisis", there is still in this country, a major gap. This gap appears to be a lack of cooperative effort in attempting to bring the resources of academe to bear on the actual development of policies on some kind of a national scale to begin to deal with what we have identified already as the urban crisis. Now, there are some programs which appear to be relevant in this area. However, it is perceived that this is beyond the scope of this paper.

INTERNAL OBSTACLES TO SUCCESSFUL PROGRAMS IN URBAN AFFAIRS AND ACADEMIC PUBLIC SERVICE

Glenn W. Fisher* **

My assignment is to analyze the obstacles within universities which reduce their capacities for academic public service to state and local governments. Underlying my analysis are two basic premises:

1. The university has resources which can and should be applied directly to the solution of urban problems. It is not necessary to inventory these resources, but the collection of capable people with a large and diverse store of specialized knowledge and skills which make up a university faculty is obviously an important part of these resources.

2. To date university efforts aimed directly at the solution of urban problems have not been overly successful. Two recent papers by William C. Pendleton spell out some of the details of the disappointing results and specify some of the obstacles to a more fruitful relationship.[1]

There is little point in repeating the points made by Pendleton. Instead I will attempt to explain some of the phenomena which he reports by analyzing the organization and goals structure of American universities. My analysis, if valid, points to some clear conclusions regarding the strategies which must be followed if there is to be a substantial improvement in the response of universities to urban problems.

A few years ago, Clark Kerr popularized the term multiversity to describe the complex, pluralistic institution that is the modern American university. His analysis of the way in which the English and German concepts of a university combined with the land grant idea and evolved into the present-day American university is an enlightening one. However, too much emphasis upon the multiversity idea may obscure the fact that the contributions of the two European models are unequal. It is true that some members of the university community would like to emphasize undergraduate teaching in the Oxford-Cambridge style while others are oriented toward community service in the land grant tradition, but these emphases are usually overshadowed by the German idea of discipline-oriented research and graduate training which found its first American expression at Johns Hopkins. This is the orientation of the most prestigious faculty members in the prestigious universities which train most of the faculty members of other universities. It is also the model which both faculty and administration commonly follow when engaged in efforts to "upgrade" their own universities.

---

[1] William C. Pendleton, Urban Studies and the University - the Ford Foundation Experience (A Ford Foundation Reprint) and University City Relations Revised (A Ford Foundation Reprint).

*I would like to express to my colleagues James Kuklinski, Paul Magelli, Marjorie Taylor, and Richard Zody, thanks for helpful comments.

**Regents Professor of Urban Affairs, Wichita State University

The primacy of the German contribution has tremendous significance for intra and inter-university organization and for the universities' ability to respond to an "urban mission." A university faculty is organized into departments which correspond to disciplines. Departments are organized into schools or colleges under deans who report to the president. Communications follow the departmental-college route upward and decisions made by the university board or president follow the same course downward. Perhaps even more important, decisions or recommendations made by the faculty are within a departmental-college framework. The primary within-institution loyalty of faculty members is to their department. The department is the basic political unit for decisions involving such important matters as curriculum and faculty personnel (hiring, tenure, and promotion).

More importantly, however, the importance of the department goes far beyond the campus boundaries of a university. A department is the local branch of discipline of the same name which is tightly knit, even if informally organized. The basic element of a discipline's organization is a national association, a number of journals and a network of academic patronage which extends from the top graduate schools to the bottom of the academic pecking order.[2]

The ability of a professor in a graduate school to place "his" or "her" graduate students depends largely upon his standing in the discipline. Standing in the discipline, in turn, depends upon the quality of his or her publications in disciplinary journals and upon personal relationships cultivated within the discipline. The newly minted Ph.D. is well schooled in the belief that achievement and eventual appointment to the faculty of a prestige graduate school depends upon the qualities that gave his or her major professor standing in the discipline. The journals, of course, serve the discipline by publishing highly specialized articles that advance knowledge and challenge the intellect of their highly specialized readers.

The ambitious faculty member is thus left with little choice. He or she must concentrate his or her energies upon the kind of research that will lead to publication in disciplinary journals and must continue and expand acquaintanceships among important or promising people in the discipline.

This particular form of university and disciplinary organization has proved to be an extremely successful way of organizing the search for new knowledge. The achievement of the modern university in creating new knowledge in many fields is an awe-inspiring one. The results of these activities have had a tremendous impact upon urban areas. In fact, it is the revolution in our ability to create new knowledge which is the basis for the technological advances that have made the present scale of urbanization possible. It should also be noted that departmental organization of universities has served the cause of undergraduate education moderately well. Disciplines provide a reasonable way of organizing courses and curriculum and professors who are engaged in research are often, but not always, more exciting teachers than are those who spend their time "preparing to teach."

---

[2] The hierarchy of university prestige and the role which this hierarchy plays in The Academic Marketplace was described in a book of the same name by Theodore Coplow and Reece J. McGee, published in 1958. My impression is that the situation has changed little since that time.

These are important advantages and I do not want to underrate their importance. Research and classroom teaching are tasks of first importance. Universities are the institutions in our society which have the best change of creating the conditions in which an effective and unbiased search for new knowledge can occur. To the extent that the departmental type of organization facilitates this task, we should be cautious about changes. At the same time, we should also recognize that this form of organization is far from satisfactory when the university turns to other tasks. For training students for many kinds of urban research and management occupations and for carrying out many kinds of urban service activities a disciplinary orientation is far too limited. The unity of method and subject matter which facilitates basic research may not be effective in solving the problems which confront a public official. Such problems seldom yield to the methodology of a single discipline.

To meet this problem universities have created other kinds of organizational units. These include professional schools and various kinds of research and service institutes or centers. These units may include people from a variety of disciplinary backgrounds, and may include departments which are oriented to a particular specialty or "applied" aspect of a traditional discipline.

The existence of this kind of organization in a university dominated by the department-disciplinary organization poses obvious problems. Young faculty employed in such organizations take a real risk with their careers. Less contact with practicing members of the discipline in which they have been trained means that disciplinary skills and attitudes become dull. Publications are apt to be in forums which would be rated "less prestigious" by discipline-dominated tenure and promotion committees. Failure to attend the disciplinary conventions means that contact with the influential persons who might open up opportunities in other universities are lost.

Often the goals of an applied research or service institute require that a faculty member spend much time in activities which neither advance him or her in the discipline nor are transferable to positions in other universities. Pendleton points out that city officials seek specific answers to immediate problems while university scholars seek answers that are general; he adds that scholars and politicians speak different languages. Actually, any competent scholar can apply his skills in the search for specific answers and, if he spends enough time in "city hall," he can learn the officials' language—but both require time and the payoff for the scholar in a discipline-dominated university is very small. To write a top-notch report on the housing problem in Cincinnati and to become recognized by influential persons in the area as the top local expert may be just as difficult as it is to develop a top-notch mathematical model of the housing problem and to become known in the national academic community as the top scholar in the field, but the payoff won't be the same.

Fortunately, the situation is not completely hopeless. University faculty members do forsake departments to take appointments in professional schools and various kinds of transdisciplinary organizational units. Some do it out of conviction, some do it for short-term monetary gain and some do it because they aren't going to get tenure in the department. In addition, some compensating mechanisms have been developed. Many professional or transdisciplinary units create their own local constituencies, their own journals and their own network of regional and national organizations which take over many of the functions performed for the departments by the disciplinary organizations. A college of business administration, for example, has formal and informal ties to the local business community: services by the college or its faculty to the community are rewarded by gifts and grants or by friendly words to local legislators. In addition, there are national and regional organizations and publications. These all help to protect and motivate the faculty member who cuts his ties to the discipline in order to serve the school. A psychologist, for example, who joins the marketing department of a college of business may lose his tie to the discipline of psychology but publications in marketing journals, appearance at business conventions, and similar activities open the doors to recognition and advancement inside or outside his present university.

Perhaps the most successful of all attempts to orient the university toward solving practical problems and serving a particular client group is that represented by the land grant universities. Land grant universities have an extensive, complex and mutual reinforcing relationship with farm organizations and with rural people. The land grant university is supported in the legislature by rural organizations. It, in turn, provides practical help on a variety of problems, supports rural interests in the public arena and glorifies rural life in a way that sometimes irritates those of us who know that most Americans are urbanites and who believe that most modern men and women will find the good life in the city--if they are going to find it at all. The colleges of agriculture in land grant universities have a complex network of state, national and regional organizations that provide the opportunity for intellectual stimulation, prestige and professional advancement. Credit for community service and "institute type" publications is assured by a system of numbering and indexing which has no counterpart in the numerous Urban Centers which exist in many universities. It is true that the close ties between land grant universities and their clients have sometimes created conflicts which seem to endanger the role of the university as a non-partisan seeker of the truth. There is often tension between the college of agriculture and its related units and other parts of the university, but these tensions have not prevented several land grant institutions from reaching top rank among American universities.

Let us turn now to the university efforts to serve urban areas. We have all heard it said that the agricultural extension idea cannot be transported to the city, and numerous examples of the failure of certain urban programs have been cited as proof. I submit that the success of agricultural colleges and the closely related experiment stations and extension services involve three essential conditions which few, if any, of the so-called urban extension programs have met. These conditions are:

1. The agricultural community is served through a comprehensive program which is a major thrust of the university. Initially, many land grant universities were formed for the specific purpose of taking advantage of the Morrill Act, but even after the growth of some of these institutions into major universities, the college of agriculture, experiment station and extension service complex remains a substantial component of the total university program. This contrasts with the small, fragmented, piecemeal nature of many so-called urban programs.

2. Agricultural programs were and are permanently established, permanently financed programs. Permanent financing makes possible the organization of programs and organizational units on a permanent basis. Administrative personnel and faculty can confidently plan careers in these areas. In contrast many urban programs have been financed by foundation grants or federal grants and staffed with personnel on loan from departments. Most faculty members have been unwilling to make any real commitment to such programs but see them as:

a) opportunities for temporary personal financial gain, or

b) sources of funds for supporting graduate students, or

c) a chance to bootleg some "real research" which can be published in a "real journal."

3. Agricultural extension has had very close relationships with the client group. Client participation has long been built into the programs and land grant universities openly admit that they serve agricultural interests. Urban programs, by contrast, have been badly splintered. Often a university will have several organizational unit serving several specific urban client groups and several which make no such identification but pretend to serve the "public interest" or find a solution which will benefit everyone. This has led to the conclusion that urban extension differs from

agricultural extension because agricultural colleges are involved in finding and teaching solutions to technical problems while urban extension programs must deal with complex political problems.

I don't deny that there is a germ of truth in this observation, but I do suggest that there is an alternative way of viewing the situation which may be more useful. It may not be so much a difference in the kind of problem as it is a difference in the spatial distribution of the client groups. In rural areas there is a correspondence between residence and economic interest. Most of the people who live in rural areas either are farmers or are engaged in serving farmers so that they have an identity of economic interest with agriculture. This characteristic simplifies the problems faced by the land grant institutions. Any service performed for farmers is apt to be approved by most persons in the area and good service is almost certain to be viewed favorably by any governmental official elected from a rural area. In urban areas a variety of interests are contained in a small geographic area. Urban universities have responded to the needs of many of these interests--business, labor, various professions, and racial groups by establishing courses, institutes and research centers; but because these groups see their interests as conflicting, the university is not seen to be successful in solving urban problems.

Clearly these circumstances do present difficulties for an urban university that desires to extend its program beyond basic research and traditional classroom teaching. Community groups which have special interests in various kinds of programs have different or conflicting interests and the university can never develop unified and coordinated programs to serve the urban area in the same way that land grant universities develop such programs in rural areas. To the extent that the university serves several groups in the community it becomes a microcosm of the pluralistic society in which we live. This, of course, is the essence of the multiversity described by Kerr and one need not be overly concerned that a certain amount of intra-university tension exists.

I suggest, however, that there is one "interest group" that occupies a position of unusual importance which might well be singled out for special attention by any university that takes its urban mission seriously. This "interest" is the one that comes closest to representing the general interest in an urban area--local government. I deny neither the practical nor theoretical problems of asserting that any group "represents" the interest of the people of an area, but the fact remains that local government officials and employees are elected by the electorate or appointed by those who have been elected. They are removable by the electorate and they, more than any other single groups, have a vested interest in the welfare of the area. Surely, these are reasons enough for a university that wants to solve urban problems to develop a special relationship with the local government.

If my analysis is correct, the strategy for university involvement in urban affairs seems clear. I'll state the main features:

1. Urban universities need to make a major commitment by organizing permanent trans-disciplinary "urban affairs" units to engage in pre-career, and continuing education of local government personnel, as well as to carry on applied research and service activities that have special value to local government. Many such units do exist but very few of them have the scale and unity of purpose which is needed.

2. Funding must be "hard money." Whether it comes from federal, state or local funds, and even the amount, is secondary to permanence. Only a permanently established, permanently funded program is likely to induce capable young faculty members to give primary allegiance to such a program.

3. The unit must work in a close cooperative relationship with local government. Perhaps the cooperative extension idea can be adapted, perhaps totally new arrangements will need to be invented; but it is important that local governments be real partners—not just people who "sign-off" on an application.

4. National organizations of local governments and of urban universities must create channels for motivating and rewarding faculty members who want to make urban concerns their career interest. Details remain to be worked out, but mechanisms might include accrediting agencies, conferences, journals, employment exchanges and all the other paraphernalia of learned societies and land grant agencies. Special attention should be given to devising systematic methods of giving credit to faculty for community service and applied research. Criteria and procedures for evaluations of achievement in their activities should be developed.

In summary, I believe that the internal obstacles to successful programs in urban affairs and academic public service can be overcome if universities and local governments are willing to commit themselves to joint action to create well planned, continuing cooperative programs. Programs must be based upon a clear recognition of the organizational structure and goals orientation of both universities and governments. I hope that this paper has contributed something to understanding the former. Another paper will be addressed to the latter.

A NEW CIVICS FOR THE NEW URBANIZATION

John Osman*

The Translation of Knowledge into Policy and Program

In the year 1955, there were less than a dozen academic public service programs to increase understanding in urban affairs. Ten years later, there were over a hundred and, today, the number has grown to more than three hundred. Why, then, has there not been an associated improvement in the management of cities and in the understanding of urbanization? Why the continuing gap between what has been learned about urban affairs and its application in the arena of action?

While writing this paper, I was invited to participate in a program that presents a classic case of why the public services of colleges and universities fail to furnish the assistance asked by local and state governments as they advance into a new era in the management of large-scale urban systems. This program was being prepared for the newly elected members of the city council of a major American city.

A cooperative program among three institutions -- a state university, a state college, and a private college -- was proposed because each of the institutions had certain capabilities. The program, when studied, revealed at least five major mistakes. First, the program was too elementary, simply seventh grade textbook civics. Second, the program ignored the fact that thirteen of the fourteen council members were reelected old "pros" in urban politics, and the one newly elected councilman was a very knowledgeable young man in urban affairs. Third, the program was largely a long list of political science professors "talking" to the council members. Fourth, the policy theme selected for analysis was a national issue in which city councils have comparative little power to exercise. Issues identified by a majority of the council as central concerns were ignored. Finally, the program is to be held on a weekend before the Christmas season.

Unquestionably, the institutions involved have much to give to these council members. There are rich resources available, but the method adopted to acquaint the council persons with new informations as well as the information itself are highly unsatisfactory. One can predict general dissatisfaction and, since this is a first-time endeavor to "educate" the council members of the state's largest city, it is likely to discourage further public service programs for them in particular and for the cities and towns of the rest of the state.

At the time I was working with this program, evaluations of efforts by a national foundation to improve the performance of the councils of two other cities came to my attention. In this instance, the foundation had employed a management team from private industry to instruct the council people in the policy process and in the arts and sciences of governing. If the evaluations were in any way accurate, these two attempts were full failures. The public's business is not run in the same way as private business and no amount of technical tricks can enable a city council or a state legislature to function well. The problem of translating knowledge into action or of informing public policy actions with the results of research is not the problem of managing a business.

---

*Fellow, Brookings Institution

Looking back over a number of years of working with the public as well as with public officials, I find that there is a giant gap or breakdown between the public services of institutions that generate new knowledge and the members of the governments needing the new knowledge. Regardless of whose fault, we simply are not applying what we know toward the solution of the problems presented by urbanization.

Only a month or so ago, a report was released that described what it calls a "functional incompetency" among a fourth of our American citizens in the discharge of the basic "office of citizen." Without doubt, the rapidity of change and the increased flow of new knowledge are so great as to encourage incompetency. Apparently, there are millions of Americans who need to be educated in order to carry out competently the simple everyday duties of responsible citizenship. Somehow our public services programs have failed to fulfill expectations in educating for the office of citizen as well as in educating public officials.

The past months have seen signs of growing concern about the capability of government at all levels to serve the people satisfactorily. It is not only the matter of morality, but also an instance of intellectual incompetence as well. The several studies reporting a loss of confidence by citizens in all our institutions, especially in government, should disturb all of us. In response, it should initiate a surge of interest in expanding public services on the part of all colleges and universities.

The Complexity of Urban Problems

What is to be done? How can we build bridges among public interest groups, colleges and universities, and local and state governments? Every urban problem is a problem in complexity. The mobilization of resources and relating them to the problem requires new institutions. Utilization of research has lagged far behind the production of research reports. Yet, despite the complexity of our problems, we know enough to solve them -- if we will but use the intelligence available to us.

There are explanations for the failure to utilize the results of recent research in policy-making and program-building by officials of local and state governments. The complexity of our problems takes a great deal more of our time than most of the officials and most of the citizens are willing to give. We cannot gain the mastery of any major policy issue even in a long weekend seminar at some rural retreat. We fail to monitor change and to trace the thrust of the trends of the time. We do not consider the consequences of our actions. We have no time for an analysis of the interactions among the system of problems which harass our city or state or nation.

Every problem and any policy prepared to solve the problem are a study in interdisciplinarity. Yet, we have few academics adept at an inter-disciplined inquiry into urban affairs. Moreover, while we expect a city councilman or a state legislator to be able to synthesize the knowledge from all the different disciplines, we do not ask the research person to do so himself. At a recent meeting for state legislators, an economist, a political scientist, a demographer, a geographer, and persons from other disciplines all offered distinctly different analyses of the employment and manpower problem. Legislators and governors present were expected to synthesize the separate solutions but the so-called experts did not, nor could they have reconciled their positions.

Another aspect of advancing the use of programs of public service in local and state governments is gaining the support of the professional civil servant, often an appointed public official of influence. These professionals have been educated, usually well educated, in some specialization, or they have made their way to a position of prominence through experience. Occasionally, they have not kept up with the new knowledge in their fields of competence; often, they have. In any case, they think that they know enough to take care of the urban problems of their city or their state. If they are insecure, they are reluctant to be shown up, to have their shortcomings revealed. The professional staff of the city council or of the state legislature does not always welcome the public services of the colleges and the university.

The tendency to turn over critical concerns to consultants has had a consequence for institutions which provide academic public services. Recently, I bid for a contract to examine the policy-making capability of a council in a city whose university has an excellent public services program that could have done the work as well or better than any agency from the outside. In this instance, a well-known consulting firm was awarded the contract, not because of the lack of credibility or absence of ability on the part of the university, but because the local research people would have done the job too well with the knowledge they had of the council's work.

Every era has a policy paradigm which furnishes the conceptual framework for policy-making and for the planning and programming of policy made. A shift in the structure of this dominant paradigm introduces a revolution in policy and in plans and programs. Right now, much if not all urban policy is being formulated on the basis of a 19th century theory of urbanization when we are caught up in what can be described as a process of counter-urbanization which demands a new policy paradigm. Demographic data describing developments of the past few years suggest a shift in policy with its implications for the program with which policy is implemented. Yet, urban affairs are being conducted as if we still lived in the highly centralized industrial cities of the 19th and early 20th centuries rather than in a national system of cities.

An enormous amount of new information is being generated every year and a tremendous body of relevant knowledge being assembled in the area of urban affairs. Capabilities of a score of disciplines are being called into public service. Clearly, the task of translating this body of knowledge about urbanization into urban policy and programs is the joint responsibility of college and university and of public officials, elected and appointed, at all levels of local and state governments. Indeed, it is necessary now to go beyond the public official and to consider the public which has become conscious of its "office as citizen" and awaits participation in public affairs.

The Civic Arts and Sciences

Urbanization is a resource. A man-made resource. Urbanization is at one and the same time an ecological process and a technological process. The major task of a program of public services in urban affairs is to help people understand the uses of urbanization as a resource. Such public services embrace the entire range of civic arts and sciences.

As technological process, the city, or the settlement system, requires a type of engineering assistance that the colleges and universities can provide. As ecological process, the urban system uses the whole range of natural sciences. In order to humanize the settlement system, the social sciences and the humanities have their utility. Civic arts and sciences embody all of these areas of knowledge. Such knowledge can be used in policy-making or in the planning and programming of policy. A major role for academic public service ought to be to improve capability in policy-making among local and state governments.

Policy ought to be a central concern because government itself is the product of policy. Formulation of policy problems and of policies to solve the problems would utilize the full force of any public services program. Cities and towns, and the states, have never had a policy-making capability; neither has academe an aptitude in policy formulation. So the public service is not to be engaged in any renewal of a past heritage; it is to be involved in inventing ways to translate knowledge into policy. The major task is to assist in establishing a policy process; after policy will come the plans and programs with which to implement policy. Policy takes one kind of knowledge; plans and programs take another kind of knowledge.

If policy is the source of government or government the product of policy, the mission of colleges and universities is to assist in the improvement of policy-making capability. A visit to any city council or to a state legislature will reveal that most of the legislation being proposed is without any policy guidance. Acts by our policy bodies lack the principles to gain good results in urban affairs. The last city council meeting ing I attended had twenty-nine items on the agenda. Twenty-seven of them were acted upon by a letter of recommendation from the city manager. At least nine of the items involved important policy considerations, but these concerns never came up.

The role of research, especially policy research, is well established among academic public service programs. A new component of this area of activity is futures research. Policy is inevitably concerned with the future and all management decisions have either positive or negative consequences for the future. There is a growing recognition of the place of futures research in government where the Congressional Research Service has such a division as a result of the "foresight clause" of the recently revised House Rules. The House Rules require a "future research" capability on the House committees in order to trace the impact and the consequences of a piece of proposed legislation before it is passed. Endeavors are underway to work this approach into the Senate legislative process.

Adoption of the "futures research" idea in localities and states has not happened. However, under the impact of the new public movement, "anticipatory democracy," the cause of futures research will receive greater recognition. It is an area of activity available to the academic public service programs of all colleges and universities aiming at assisting in urban affairs. If the public official uses the wrong paradigm, or does not anticipate the consequences of actions with accuracy, then the actions are not only purposeless, they can be highly harmful.

The Organization of Knowledge

Organizing old knowledge and keeping up with new knowledge concerning urbanization is a tremendous task intellectually. After all, the problems of urbanization are essentially intellectual problems and marshalling the intelligence to manage human settlement systems is an intellectual task. There are no tricks in providing public services. Making knowledge operational in urban affairs is a task in itself and not yet mastered. Organizing and classifying the new knowledge being generated by research requires constant attention. Then there is the necessity to translate the knowledge into the policies and programs of a particular place.

The Brookings Institution has had a public service program in urban affairs for over fifteen years. When it began, the only specifically "urban" knowledge was the province of the sociologist or the political scientist. It was not until the mid 1960s that the urban economist emerged, and the urban geographer came soon afterwards. Then as environmental concerns came into prominence, the natural sciences were utilized as policy sciences. There is still the great unused area of the humanities which has not been adequately appropriated for urban policy programs.

Evolution of the civic arts and sciences as revealed in the Brookings experience suggests that colleges and universities assume the mission of organizing a "new civics" for the new urbanization. In retrospect, the social sciences were the only resource of a public service program for a number of years; then we turned to the natural sciences, and still have to make use of the humanities. As far as I can make out, it has been difficult to translate the knowledge of the humanities into public policy in the same way we have used the social and natural sciences. It remains for institutions of public service to work out a satisfactory epistemology of public policy, that is, ways of translating knowledge into policy.

Evidently, from the state of affairs among our cities, something is wrong or is not working. From my perspective, it appears to be in the policy paradigm we are using. Caught up in a process that can be best described as counter-urbanization, the public officials, elected and appointed, at all levels are making decisions within the framework of an obsolete policy paradigm. Just as the new universe of Einstein needed a new physics, the new urbanization of this last quarter of the 20th century demands a new civics. If academic programs are to provide the public services in urban affairs that will be meaningful, first of all they will have to help construct a new policy paradigm and then provide for the monitoring of change so that the paradigm will shift with changing circumstances. This means organizing all our urban knowledge in a new conceptual framework in order to make it useful. It may be that our present predicament is due to the failure to change our policy paradigm.

The solution to our problems in urban affairs does not abide in a body of professional or semi-professional analysts or consultants. In a democracy, each council member, each legislator and, indeed, each citizen will have to be his/her own analyst. We cannot turn policy-making over to a professional corps or to a cadre of Consultants. We have to educate every official to be his own policy analyst and every citizen to understand the implications of a policy decision. Twenty or thirty institutes of policy analysis are not enough. Every community needs to educate citizens and public officials alike in the invention, the analysis, and the implementation of policy. Only an expanded program of public services by the universities and colleges of this country can make every American a policy analyst and an effective citizen.

Organizing for such programs has precedents. Wichita, Kansas, and Memphis, Tennessee, have a regular arrangement where the City Commission in the instance of Wichita and the City Council in the case of Memphis have been working in depth in the study of the new urbanization and its implications for policy. Wichita State University and Southwestern at Memphis have been the institutional bases upon which the programs in the civic arts and sciences have been built. While one institution is a university and the other is a college, in both instances the institutions have been willing to invest in the welfare of their respective communities in order to increase civic competence.

On the other hand, none has had the full funding and the full faculty to organize the needed knowledge and to build the programs that would provide the city or the state with satisfactory public services. Some of this problem can be attributed to the fact that the institutions have not convinced the members of governments that they have something that will help in the work of governing. The time is at hand for an institution to be invented for the purpose of advancing the use of public services among state and local governments. Such an institution would work with public interest groups, with local and state governments, and with colleges and universities to bring about a coalition of forces. Every city and town, every rural hamlet in this country comes within commuting distances of a university or college which can assist in informing policy problems and in proposing policy solutions. Every city and town is composed of public interest groups, of government, and enjoys access to the resources of a university or college -- or of several of them. The task is to bring the three parties together.

Civic education is involved — education for citizenship. We need to revive the office of citizen as well as to recognize the responsibilities of the public official. We are living in a time of "participatory democracy," and we are moving into the age of "anticipatory democracy." American citizens will no longer be satisfied with just an "impact" or an "influence" upon policy and programs, rather, they will demand as a right of their office of citizen the privilege of participation in policy-making. Some institution will have the responsibility of educating this new citizen.

As I view it, only our colleges and universities have the resources to respond to this call. Only our colleges and universities can civilize our society. Only our colleges and universities have created the knowledge which we translate into public policy. It is this public policy which will guide the nation into its third century of history. This is a heavy burden to place upon academic public service programs, but I know of no other institution upon which to put the burden of the future of this land.

COOPERATIVE PROBLEM SOLVING:
A PRACTITIONER'S VIEW

James D. Williams*

In an effort to examine cooperative approaches between educational institutions and government agencies for urban problem solving, this paper addresses, from a practitioner's view, three areas: (1) current cooperative efforts, (2) problems associated with these efforts, and (3) suggested new areas for cooperation and assistance.

Current Cooperative Efforts

In the public service coalition which presently exists between educational institutions and governmental agencies, probably the most widely experienced cooperation is internship programs. These are primarily university or college organized with an effort to supply individual students to cities for a work-study program. The program usually encompasses a semester of work relating to some project or projects required by the host agency. In the California experience, the private universities, the state university system, and the University of California all participate with local government agencies in internship programs with established, organized placement activities which monitor the progress of the student. In many instances the internship provides class credit toward degree requirements.

These programs are under scrutiny by educational institutions at the present time, emphasis being placed on joint agreements between the host agency and the student as to the projects which will be accomplished. This approach has been taken to formalize the process and avoid the situation of the student's time not being used constructively, whether from his own standpoint or that of the host agency.

A variation of this approach is the Urban Corps which operates through the Urban Corps office, a centralized administration, and is offered through the support of the federal college work study program. The program is well structured with specific requirements established for the participating government agencies as well as students.

The City of Tacoma, Washington, has established a somewhat unique approach, which has been called a "teaching government." In this program, the city hall serves as the location for the teaching process and graduate students are assigned work projects of use to the city within the departmental organizations. One difference between this program and other internships is the assignment of a coordinator at city hall who monitors and coordinates each of the student programs. Specific research or operational projects for the city are assigned to the students. In addition, faculty members work closely with the students and coordinator for project completion. Examples of projects which have been undertaken by students include departmental reorganization studies and labor relations activities. The student paper is reviewed by faculty members as well as department heads of the city for evaluation as an academic project as well as evaluation as an operational staff report.

---

*City Manager, Santa Monica, California.

The University of California at Los Angeles under the MBA program has designed a team student consultant project. Although originated as a consultant service and teaching program for private businesses, some cities have begun to use this service. Under this program a team of students with faculty advisors undertakes a specific project for the host agency. The project to be undertaken is based upon joint agreement between the students, their faculty advisors, and the host. There are no fees charged, however, expenses are paid by the client which may include special research materials, transportation for the students and any costs associated with the production of the project report. Emphasis is upon completion of the project within approximately a four month period. The project is used in lieu of a thesis for the MBA degree.

A somewhat new direction is being taken by the University of Southern California in its school of public administration wherein a computer simulation exercise is being undertaken with several cities. The project is in the design phase, the determination being made of which projects to undertake for stimulation. The present exploration includes simulation exercises for teaching games, policy testing, performance appraisal and organizational development. Emphasis is upon regional orientation, rather than a specific city or governmental agency at the present time.

Finally, we should recognize the use of practitioners as instructors in the schools of public administration throughout the country. Public managers frequently act as part-time faculty. In some instances, the public manager may take leave, but more frequently the process involves teaching evening classes. There has been a limited use of faculty members in the practitioner role and this will be discussed later in the paper.

Functional Problems

There are of course problems associated with joint efforts between government and educational institutions. Suspicion toward the academic community exists among elected officials and their appointees since faculty and students may have, and frequently do have, different political orientations than those governing the client or host agency. There is concern that these outsiders will raise embarrassing political questions which will reach a level of broad public discussion. While this would seem to be a goal of democratic institutions, it frequently causes severe heartburn among those of us who are appointed by elected officials.

There are in addition differences in time orientation. Operational agencies, such as city or county governments, frequently have a short-range view such as the next election, or the upcoming fiscal year. These agencies tend to search for immediate solutions, looking toward short-range political practicality and financial requirements.

Educational institutions frequently have a theoretical orientation and may wish to examine the problem placed before them in a scope much greater than that of the public agency. While this may be appropriate, it is a differing orientation which may cause conflicts in the problem solving effort. There is a tendency for all outside consultants to deal with problems on a general plane and not to relate the solutions to the specific history, social forces and political needs of the client community. There may be difficulty in achieving a "workable solution", one which will meet these social and political requirements.

Another major problem area can be the term of study since the time available to students and sometimes faculty may be a relatively short period--a semester, or at best, an academic year. If a long-range project is involved, turnover of participating personnel may be too high to maintain continuity in the project. Internships are usually one semester and the reference frame of the student is relatively short. It becomes difficult to collate data, analyze the data, and present project solutions within a short time using the same staff. Obviously, the project may be continued with several students, but continuity is lost which creates difficulty in arriving at solutions.

New Areas for Cooperation

Given these problems and the work that has gone on before, consideration should be given to future efforts for cooperative urban problem solving. One of the major changes which should occur is the restructuring of the university reward system. Presently, great emphasis is placed upon publication; certainly tenure and position in the academic hierarchy are based upon this accomplishment. This limits the ability of the public agency to have access to a major asset of educational institutions and that is faculty expertise. I am suggesting that highly expert faculty will not be available for specific projects due to the severe time requirements for publication. A reward system should be established which would allow faculty to be directly involved as practitioners with local government. This could involve a sabbatical with assignment to a government agency for a period of one or more years to complete a specific project. Host agencies could pay the faculty member's salary or perhaps a joint agreement could be made between the host agency and the academic institution for salary sharing. A primary advantage of this approach would be the full-time availability of a person with advanced knowledge in a field of value to the client agency. Such a process could also serve to provide extensive practical experience to educators.

A second approach for future urban problem solving would be extension of the case study method on a team basis in the manner suggested by the UCLA program outlined above. This approach would combine student and faculty teams for project or problem solution. It is now relatively common among local government organizations to use team approaches in problem solving, combining specific areas of expertise from the city staff for problem solution. The inclusion of a university team including faculty as well as students should be accomplished with ease. This, of course, does not solve the problem of short-term involvement outlined above, however, a variation could overcome this difficulty. This would include the assignment of a faculty team with areas of knowledge required by the host agency for a longer period of time. Since faculty would not be bound by the time constraints of students who must advance to other course material or graduation, longer term commitment to highly complex problems could be accomplished.

Problem solving for local governments with the aid of educational institutions has, in my opinion, been effective. The internship programs, special projects such as computer simulation and the team programs have been useful and helpful to the practitioner. There have been problems and there will continue to be problems, although those outlined in this paper can be overcome. I would emphasize that in helping those of us involved in the daily administration of local government that a commitment be made to reward faculty for direct longer term involvement with public agencies. We should, as a result, both benefit to a very high degree.

SUMMARY

A PLANNING PROJECT TO DEVELOP A COOPERATIVE ACTION PROGRAM IN URBAN AFFAIRS AND ACADEMIC PUBLIC SERVICE

Introduction

Various sectors of the American Scene can and do provide scientific and technological services to assist in the resolution of problems of local and state governments. Higher education is but one important sector. However, institutions of higher education uniquely combine three significant and relevant roles--training, research, and public service--all of which, singly or in various strategic combinations, have extraordinary potential for helping solve many problems of American communities.

Although some colleges and universities have implemented effective public service programs, many more are still searching for effective interactive roles and productive working relationships with state and city officials. Furthermore, interaction at every level is especially vital today with the responsibilities and resources for problem-solving being shared by all levels of government.

At present, there is no national higher education organization or association with an office whose mission it is to encourage colleges and universities to systematically explore the means to expand their capacities for academic public service to state and local governments. There are no formal linkages between national higher education associations and national public interest organizations.

The Project

To assist universities and colleges in more effectively directing their resources to the needs and requirements of state and local governments, it has been proposed that plans be considered for the development of an active working group consisting of key individuals representing national, state and local governmental public interest groups, federal agencies, private foundations and higher education associations and councils in order to build the foundation for a cooperative action program in urban affairs and academic public service.

To determine the viability of such an effort, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, in cooperation with the International City Management Association,has obtained a planning grant from the National Science Foundation.

from each participating organization. This information will be reviewed and discussed at a planning meeting of staff personnel to be held prior to the workshop. After this planning meeting, specific workshop agenda items will be finalized.

The Planning Agenda

Although each participating organization will be asked to consider the agenda in terms of how any programs supported or systems developed through such a coalition might assist in meeting goals and objectives in terms of their own organization, several general questions should be noted:

1. Could a program based on a continued association of these organizations improve higher education's ability to react to the needs of state and local governments for technical assistance, applied research or training?
2. Could such a program assist in the identification of national needs and the development of improved federal agency responses to those needs?
3. Could such a program foster improved relationships between colleges and universities and state and local governments?
4. Are there some areas of services or new processes or mechanisms that collaborative programs might foster that will provide new opportunities for improved academic public service responses by higher education that are not presently available or effectively utilized?

Operational Plans

For planning purposes it is being assumed that the workshop will find common interest around which some longer range program might be designed and implemented. It has been envisioned early in the development of this project that an Office of Urban Affairs and Academic Public Service operated by AASCU, representing a number of educational associations and in cooperation with other organizations participating in the planning program, could be developed. Specific organizational elements should be part of the workshop agenda. An additional workshop agenda will have to consider followup proposals requesting ongoing program support and specific program objectives.

8. Disseminating model case studies or inventories of innovative programs and strategies with a history of success. This could include publishing a newsletter to systematically communicate up-to-date information from the above activities.

It is hoped that prior to the workshop, the organizational participants will have an opportunity to react to these suggestions, making additions, suggesting improvements and specific program elements for implementation.
